UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3096
16 July 1992

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 16 July 1992, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. JESUS	(Cape Verde)
Members:	Austria	Mr. HOHENFELLNER
	Belgium	Mr. NOTERDAEME
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Ecuador	Mr. AYALA LASSO
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	Hungary	Mr. ERDOS
	India	Mr. GHAREKHAN
	Japan	Mr. HATANO
	Morocco	Mr. BENJELLOUN-TOUIMI
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PERKINS
	Venezuela	Mr. ARRIA
	Zimbabwe	Mr. SHAMUYARIRA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

92-60924 9252-53V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 2 JULY 1992 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF MADAGASCAR TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/24232)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 3095th meeting, I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal to take a place at the Council table. I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Indonesia, Lesotho, Malaysia, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ka (Senegal) and Mr. Pik Botha (South Africa) took places at the Council table; Mr. Brahimi (Algeria), Mr. Pedro de Castro Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Hurst (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Butler (Australia), Mr. Maycock (Barbados), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil), Ms. Fréchette (Canada), Mr. Ganga (Congo), Mr. Mujica Cantelar (Cuba), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau (Germany), Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia), Mr. Phoofolo (Lesotho), Mr. Razali (Malaysia), Mr. Huaraka (Namibia), Mr. Acharya (Nepal), Mr. Van Schaik (Netherlands),

Mr. Willberg (New Zealand), Mr. Nwachuku (Nigeria), Mr. Huslid (Norway), Mr. Luna (Peru), Mr. Mendez (Philippines), Miss Mendes (Portugal), Mr. Yañez Barnuevo (Spain), Mr. Nandoe (Suriname), Mr. Osvald (Sweden), Mr. Ssemogerere (Uganda), Mr. Batiouk (Ukraine), Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire) and Mr. Musuka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Italy, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Traxler (Italy) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 15 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that, during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to the following individuals: Mr. Bantu Holomisa; Mr. Essop Pahad; Mr. Philip Mahlangu; Mr. Manguezi Zitha."

(The President)

That letter will be published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/24298.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Holomisa, Mr. Pahad, Mr. Mahlangu and Mr. Zitha.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/24288, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/24291, which contains the text of a letter dated 15 July 1992 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid addressed to the Secretary-General. Members of the Council have also received photocopies of a letter dated 15 July 1992 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/24292.

The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, His Excellency Mr. Roelof Frederik Botha. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): As the representative of an African country I welcome the fact that this meeting is being held under the presidency of a fellow African. It is also the first occasion on which my Government has had the honour to address the Council while the Secretariat is under the stewardship of another distinguished African, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. My Government acknowledges the significant contributions of the President and Secretary-General and wishes them well in the execution of their responsibilities.

With a few exceptions, the debate thus far has been characterized by a sincere desire to encourage South African leaders to join hands in curbing the violence in South Africa and to carry on with our task of negotiating a new constitution which would create a democratic, non-racial, united South

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

Africa. I am struck by the even-handedness of the Council's approach. We appreciate it.

Before proceeding to address the main issue of violence, which is the central theme of this debate, I feel that it is incumbent on me to share with the Council my feelings as I walked through the passages of the United Nations building as well as the ruins of apartheid.

The first time that I attended a United Nations session was in 1966. Some members here were a little younger. The International Court of Justice had just delivered its judgement in the case which Ethiopia and Liberia had brought against South Africa. The dismissal of the claims of Ethiopia and Liberia resulted in a political storm in the General Assembly. We won our legal case, but we lost the political case. It was then clearer than ever that apartheid would make South Africa a loser everywhere.

We are all children of history. Each of us is the product of our time and place on this Earth, and we are best understood in that context.

I am a South African. I am also an Afrikaner. I belong to a people that settled in the south of Africa more than 300 years ago, before the American forefathers came here. We have struggled through the centuries to survive. We have established ourselves as part of Africa. We call ourselves and our language after our continent. Africa is part of us. And now that apartheid is going we are accepted as part of Africa. I want to make use of this opportunity today in this Council to express my appreciation to my African friends for their acceptance of the irreversibility of the changes which President de Klerk has initiated.

For me personally this is a great moment, a moment of hope because of the understanding of many African countries for the complexities which confront us in transforming our country to a full democracy.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

Like the other peoples of Africa and the world, the Afrikaner has also yearned for freedom, security and the right to govern ourselves. My people embarked on the Great Trek, choosing to embrace the dangers and uncertainties of pioneer life and the freedom it promised, rather than submit to imperial domination. We fought for that freedom through numerous battles against overwhelming odds, at a time when Africa was being colonized. During the Anglo-Boer War our forefathers captured the imagination of the whole world, defending their freedom against the mightiest colonial Power of the day, in what became Africa's first liberation war. The Afrikaner became Africa's first liberation movement.

We lost that war. We paid a heavy price. The Afrikaner dreamt of a republic in which he could be free and independent and secure, where our nationalism and aspirations could find full expression, and where we could determine our own future. Our poets expressed our visions and fears, our shortcomings and hopes, in our own language - Afrikaans. We clustered ourselves around our poverty, our language, our churches, our schools, our farms.

The dream of our own republic was realized in 1961. The emotional yearning of our people had finally brought forth a sovereign State we could call our own Republic.

Now, with the benefit of hindsight, it is clear that the dream could not last, because apartheid became the foundation. The denial of human rights to our black compatriots robbed the dream of all morality. The inevitability of economic integration completed the demolition.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

In a painful sense the whites of South Africa became apartheid's victims, the Afrikaner as much as anybody else. We who had fought so hard, and paid such a terrible price for our own freedom, failed to realize that we could not truly be free until every South African could share that freedom with us.

I have fought against racial discrimination all my life. In 1974 I stated my position in this Council. It is on record. I have done so on many other occasions inside and outside South Africa. Against this background I greeted President F. W. de Klerk's assumption of office in 1989. I am proud to be a member of his Government, to have participated in tearing down the pillars of apartheid and in setting my country irrevocably on a course towards freedom and democracy for all our people.

In his inauguration speech on 14 September 1989 President de Klerk stated the goal of the South African Government as: a totally changed South Africa; a South Africa which has rid itself of the antagonisms of the past; a South Africa free of domination or oppression in whatever form; a South Africa within which the democratic forces - all reasonable people - align themselves behind mutually acceptable goals and against radicalism, irrespective of where it comes from.

This was what the State President committed the South African Government to achieving. It is beyond dispute that the measures taken by President de Klerk since then prove not only his resolve, but also his commitment to fulfil what he pledged to do. He did what he promised.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

On 2 February 1990, at the opening of Parliament, President de Klerk announced: the lifting of prohibitions on the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the South African Communist Party and their subsidiary organizations; he announced that all political prisoners would be released; that existing security legislation would be drastically revised.

The dedication of my Government to its goals was further illustrated by the signing in 1990 of the Groote Schuur and Pretoria Minutes. In these documents my Government and the ANC/Communist Party alliance agreed on a common commitment towards the resolution of the climate of violence and intimidation, as well as a commitment to stability and the peaceful process of negotiation.

Further measures taken by my Government in 1990 were: the abolition of the Separate Amenities Act; the lifting of the state of emergency throughout South Africa.

All of these actions were followed by the following landmark steps taken by my Government in 1991: the abolition of the Group Areas Act, the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936 and the Population Registration Act, thus removing the three main pillars of apartheid; President de Klerk's initiative led to a Peace Summit and the signing of the National Peace Accord; and then there was the establishment of a permanent commission on public violence and intimidation under the chairmanship of Judge Goldstone.

It is my Government's view that all political prisoners have been released. The ANC/Communist Party alliance, however, seemed to forget that in terms of an agreement signed by one of its senior representatives on 30 June 1991, they agreed that the matter was disposed of. Subsequently, the

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

alliance has expressed reservations and claimed that there were still people in prison who qualified for political-prisoner status. This, I may say, is not in terms of the Norgaard principles. However, my Government is prepared to discuss a package deal with the ANC/Communist Party alliance to dispose of a number of outstanding matters, which could include the dispute on the question of political prisoners. This is one of the matters which should be addressed in bilateral talks between the Government and the ANC/Communist Party alliance.

We still hear the complaint that all South Africans are not represented in the current Parliament. However, the fundamental purpose of President de Klerk's initiatives since his assumption of office, and every legislative and policy decision of the Government has exactly, precisely, been to rectify that position. This is what it is about. It is no longer in question. It is not an issue. The issue is the negotiation of a new constitution to give effect to the changed situation. But with all respect to my friends in the ANC/Communist Party alliance, there is a comparable question which they ought to answer: have you shed the doctrines which the South African Communist Party insists on including in a new constitution? Have you shed those doctrines? Are you prepared to reveal the names of the members of the South African Communist Party - one of the oldest communist parties in the world - serving in the ANC Executive? Why keep it secret?

A watershed in South Africa's political history was reached when the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) met for the first time in December 1991 to discuss my country's political future. The fact that CODESA has twice been convened proves that my Government honoured its undertaking to move as speedily as possible towards agreement on a new constitution for South

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

Africa. We shall not waver from this course. I would urge here today that others stay the course with us. Negotiation is not the best alternative: It is the only alternative.

Withdrawal from discussion will not bring about a solution. Neither will threats. Obstacles to negotiations arose not only because of deep-rooted differences between my Government and the ANC/Communist Party alliance but also because of fundamental differences between the alliance and other parties in South Africa. These differences will arise throughout the process of negotiation, but whenever they occur they should form the agenda of discussions in which we stand ready to participate.

For months the world has witnessed the major parties in South Africa negotiating a new future. This Council will know that much has been achieved. It has been a tough learning process for all of us. I am encouraged by the fact that, despite our differences, the capacity of South Africans for reconciliation and compromise has been and continues to be in ample evidence. Perhaps nothing illustrates this point more dramatically than the overwhelming support which President de Klerk received in March this year, when, in a referendum among white voters, nearly 70 per cent chose the path of negotiation for a future of power-sharing among all our people. More than that, it represents a clear and definitive break with the past and signals the irreversibility of changes initiated by President de Klerk. In short, the referendum closed the book on apartheid finally. It struck me that our African friends display a greater satisfaction as the result of the referendum than the rest of the world. I am grateful that our African friends saw in the referendum a final break with apartheid.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

The causes of the violence in South Africa are complex and multidimensional. Sadly, violence emerged in the wake of the dismantling of apartheid. It could perhaps be argued that no society could attempt so fundamental a change without discord and turbulence, without violence and instability. But for a Government, however, and for all people of good will, that is not acceptable. Every life lost, every person injured, is a cause for grief and sorrow, not only for the pain it inflicts, but also for the damage it does to us as a nation and the delays which it brings to our transformation process. It leaves an indelible stain on our national conscience. We cannot heal as a nation when so many of our countrymen are bleeding. The violence must end.

The ANC/Communist Party alliance claims to be the only victim of violence. It bases its claim on what it describes as its unilateral decision to suspend violence. In fact, this decision was part of an agreement reached with my Government and embodied in the Pretoria Minute of 6 August 1990. I know: I was personally present at the meeting.

In practice, substantial evidence reveals that the major cause of death in incidents of violence in South Africa is the use of AK-47 assault rifles. Only two days ago, the ANC/Communist Party alliance, in a public statement, admitted to the existence of arms caches inside South Africa. It is not me telling the story: They said so.

On the very day of my departure for New York last Sunday to attend this meeting, information reached us that the ANC/Communist Party alliance had issued instructions to its representative in Harare to transfer weapons stored at Mashvinga in Zimbabwe to the northern border of the Transvaal for infiltration into South Africa. These weapons included automatic assault

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

rifles and grenade launchers and would be transported with the assistance of the Zimbabwean army. These reports should be seen against the background of the admission by an ANC National Executive Committee member, Mr. Joe Modise. He admitted that there was an ANC arsenal located outside Luanda. The arsenal comprises some 27,000 tons of armaments, including over 2,000 AK-47 rifles and 2 million rounds of ammunition. If these reports are correct, it is cause for grave concern. However, there is therefore all the more reason for us to discuss these matters rather than simply walking away from the negotiating process, and I cannot, as I am now talking to you, allege here that the ANC leadership was aware of these reports. It is my responsibility and duty, and we owe it to each other, to discuss these matters with each other. This is the only way to remove suspicion. And this is our duty.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

These developments illustrate how difficult the task of creating a climate conducive to peaceful negotiations has become.

My Government has been reminded throughout this debate that it bears the primary responsibility for maintaining order. Yes, correct. My Government accepts that responsibility but that does not mean that the other parties to the National Peace Accord are absolved from their commitments. All of us signed that Accord. All of us undertook certain firm categoric commitments.

In the days of apartheid, a variety of differing political groups were united in their opposition to the policies of the day. Now that apartheid has gone, they are no longer united. Their historical, natural differences have come to the fore; differences which, among other things, include both ideological and ethnic differences. It hurts me to be accused of fomenting violence between ethnic groups in my country when we have at last removed ourselves from apartheid. What interest would I have when my Party's membership is open and when we are recruiting black members, because it is only with the sufficient support of black members can we become a majority party. We have every intention of making the National Party a majority party. That can only be done if we succeed in gaining a substantial number of votes from every section of our people. To entrench a white veto would alienate voters, deny us a majority and repudiate the referendum result. Surely that must be clear to every member of the Council. I urge the Council to accept once and for all that my Party is not a white party any longer. We offer a political home to every South African subscribing to the Party's principles. Not only do we reject racism; we are committed to a Constitution that will make it impossible to allocate any rights on the basis of race or colour. We reject the notion that moral norms are the prerogative of any

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

racial or ethnic group. We want to build a new nation with shared values as the only binding force.

A perception has been created, particularly after the tragic event at Boipatong on 17 June that the South African Government is somehow or another involved in either fomenting violence or acquiescing in violence.

To accuse the Government of fostering violence is an insult. That would be against everything my Government stands for; it would violate every principle and every policy objective which we pursue. Not only are the killings reprehensible but they run counter to South Africa's urgent need for investment, economic growth and job creation. Furthermore - and who should know it better than I? - we have as a result of the removal of apartheid succeeded in persuading important countries all over the world to lift sanctions in some form or another. How can it be argued that we, as a Government, foment violence, knowing what the result would be, both at home and abroad? It is beyond my comprehension that I can be Minister of Foreign Affairs, who fought so hard to get sanctions removed, and then be part of some scheme in my country to destroy the very objectives that I have pursued all my life. It makes no sense - no sense whatsoever.

The truth is that President De Klerk has taken initiative upon initiative to combat the violence, often without the support of other parties. It was as a result of his initiative that the National Peace Accord came into being on 14 September last year. It was his initiative that led to the appointment of the Goldstone Commission, with the consent of the ANC and Inkatha, and I can testify to this. President De Klerk has made many attempts to arrange a joint meeting between himself and Mr. Mandela and Mr. Buthelezi in order to create a firm impression in the minds of our people that the leaders of the three main

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

parties are ad idem, are together, on the issue of violence and that they would act jointly to reduce it. So far it has not been possible to arrange such a meeting. As recently as 2 July President De Klerk again proposed to Mr. Mandela an urgent meeting with himself, Mr. Mandela and Mr. Buthelezi, because it is a fact that most of the violence occurs between the supporters of the ANC/Communist Party alliance, on the one hand, and the Inkatha Freedom Party, on the other hand. The agenda for such a meeting could be to consider - I want to emphasize that this meeting can still take place, and I invite here today, in this Council, the ANC and Inkatha to come to this meeting - the following agenda: (a) an active full-time monitoring mechanism on the adequacy, efficacy and performance of all the instruments and processes already in place to combat violence and intimidation; and (b) the advisability of a joint monitoring body through which the three parties could act to defuse and solve problems that could give rise to violence. The role of the international community, including this Council, in an observer or other acceptable capacity could be considered, especially in relation to this item.

To date Mr. Mandela has responded negatively. It is trusted that the ANC/Communist Party alliance would reconsider their attitude on this important matter and join the Government in its resolve to curb violence.

In other efforts to put an end to the violence, the Government has increased the police force and the police budget. The police budget increased by nearly 90 per cent between 1990-1991 and 1992-1993, from some R3 billion to over R5.6 billion. A recruitment drive from 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991 led to an increase in the police force of 20,500. A new campaign is aimed at expanding it by a further 11,000, while its logistic capability is being improved by the acquisition of modern equipment. All the leaders must act

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

jointly and they must agree to cooperate unconditionally in the existing mechanisms designed to control and reduce the violence or we must consider additional structures and steps if the existing ones are found to be ineffective.

Another dimension of the violence - I said it is multidimentional - is the role played by the radicals on the far left and the far right. They have one common objective: the failure of negotiations towards a new constitution in which they do not wish to participate. They do not want a democratic constitution.

Yet another factor that contributes towards the violence is the high crime rate due in large measure to the growing unemployment in the country. We have up to 2 million foreign workers from our neighbouring States taking jobs from our own people, but we cannot send them back because they feed back home perhaps 6 million to 7 million members of their families.

Boipatong and all the other instances of wanton killing give us as much pain as they do any other party. That is precisely why President De Klerk visited Boipatong: to share in the grief of the bereaved. He was greeted with goodwill on his way there but as soon as some demonstrators appeared, it became clear that his visit was being used as an excuse by certain parties to further their political aims. Nevertheless, I assure the Council that we will continue our efforts to demonstrate to our people, all our people, that we care and that we shall not deviate from our firm resolve to end violence.

Yet there are those who continue to make the charge that my Government instigates violence. I repeat my Government's invitation to anybody who believes he has evidence to that effect to come forward in order that such claims can be tested.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

Judge Goldstone stated in his Second Interim Report,

"The Commission has at all times been convinced, and remains so, that factual findings cannot be made against individuals, groups or organizations on the basis of untested evidence."

He also said,

"No good purpose will be served by merely conducting further inquiries in order to apportion the blame for past violence. It must be accepted that the individual policemen, African National Congress supporters and Inkatha Freedom Party supporters have been guilty of serious criminal conduct in this regard. If we are to curb this violence, then all our efforts must be harnessed in creating the means of doing so."

We respect Judge Goldstone's findings, and also those which are critical of official conduct. I urge the ANC/Communist Party alliance to do likewise.

Painful revelations may come to the fore, painful revelations as regards excesses and irregular actions of individuals in official agencies. But that is precisely the purpose of an open society. We do not claim perfection. Our duty is to assure openness and prosecution of irregularities.

The Boipatong tragedy was immediately and maximally exploited without waiting for the facts to be established by proper investigation. Furthermore, witnesses were instructed not to cooperate with the police investigation.

In spite of this, I can now report to the Council that the police and the Goldstone Commission made good progress with their investigation into the Boipatong events. The Commission, at the State President's suggestion, coopted Mr. Justice Baghwati, former Chief Justice of India, for this task. Professor Wadddington, a professor of criminal law at Reading University in the United Kingdom, and two senior British police officers joined the police investigation.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

Knowing full well that aspects of Judge Goldstone's report are critical of the Government, I wish nevertheless to read out to members an extract from his Interim Report on Boipatong. He says,

"No evidence was submitted to the Commission which in any way justifies allegations of any direct complicity in the planning of current violence by the State President, any member of the Cabinet or any highly placed officer in the South African Police or Defence Force.

"In the absence of such evidence the Commission considers that allegations to the effect that Government and Security Force leaders are themselves directly responsible for the commission of violence are unwise, unfair and dangerous.

"They are dangerous particularly because they are likely to exacerbate the climate of violence and frustrate and retard attempts to curb violence."

I can also report that the police have worked round the clock, making every conceivable effort to bring the perpetrators to justice. Eighty-two residents of the Kwa-Madala Hostel have been arrested on suspicion of murder; more than 1,000 sworn statements have been taken and a large number of weapons have been submitted for forensic testing. The police have also recovered personal belongings claimed by the residents of Boipatong, which were allegedly stolen on the night of the incident. It is therefore clear that the law-enforcement authorities are doing everything within their power to see that justice prevails. They must, however, proceed within the framework legal procedures. There is no longer a state of emergency in South Africa.

The tragedy of Boipatong has been extensively covered by the news media throughout the world. The Council will wish to note that important reports and commentaries have appeared in some of the most influential newspapers in a

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

number of countries over the past few days and weeks. I can refer the Council to The Daily Express (London), 23 June 1992; the Saudi Gazette, 25 June 1992; The Sunday Times (Johannesburg), 28 June 1992; The Wall Street Journal, 7 and 10 July 1992; The Times (London), 14 July 1992; The Daily Telegraph (London), 14 July 1992; The Washington Post, 13 and 15 July; De Telegraaf (Netherlands), 14 July 1992; Newsweek, 6 July, 1992; The Guardian (London), 30 June, 1992; and Neue Zurcher Zeitung (Switzerland), 25 June 1992.

The general tone of all these reports and commentaries is that the causes of the killings should be properly investigated before any blame can be apportioned, and these are responsible newspapers. Incidents are reported in these newspapers which trace the root cause of the tragedy to the conflict between Inkatha on the one hand, and the ANC/Communist Party alliance on the other, thus endorsing the findings of the Goldstone Commission on the issue of violence in general.

In the course of its investigations into the causes of violence, the Goldstone Commission made several recommendations. These included criticism of the deployment of 32 Battalion by the South African Defence Force and the former Koevoet unit by the South African Police. The Commission also criticized the carrying of traditional weapons and certain aspects affecting the accommodation of single migrant workers in hostels. The Government regards the criticism of the Goldstone Commission in a serious light.

In response President de Klerk announced two days ago that 32 Battalion is to be disbanded and its members absorbed into other existing units of the Defence Force; that the special Crime Investigation Support Unit in which former Koevoet members were serving was to be disbanded and its members who wished to join the South African Police on a permanent basis be allowed to do so. They are to be employed mainly in the combating of livestock theft on a

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

decentralized basis; furthermore, that the carrying of all dangerous weapons in public places in areas of unrest is to be prohibited.

As regards the hostels, President De Klerk reconfirmed two days ago the policy decisions which we have already taken in this regard, including the provision of substantial funds for the upgrading and conversion of this type of accommodation, and urgent consultation directly with the inhabitants, neighbouring townships and local authorities.

Further consideration is being given to the specific recommendations of the Goldstone Commission in this regard and, where appropriate, certain aspects will be referred back to the Commission for further investigation of this very complex issue. What I am saying to the Council is that a meeting under the chairmanship of President De Klerk himself took place. This is how serious we consider these matters.

I can also report a further potentially positive development that emerged on 14 July 1992 from a series of meetings which the International Panel on Mass Demonstrations, Marches and Picketing has held with representatives of the South African Police, the African National Congress, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), the Department of Justice and the Inkatha Freedom Party.

This development offers an opportunity for opposing parties and the South African Police to act jointly in preventing violence and become an example of what can be achieved if we in South Africa realize that the solutions are in our hands and minds.

While most people and most political parties support peace and democracy, it is a problem that they do not mean the same things and they do not use the same words. As we differ ideologically, so do our visions of peace and

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

democracy. My Government also pursues peace and democracy; but more than that, it also pursues prosperity.

Peace, in my Government's view, is more than the absence of violence and war. It includes the right of citizens to live in an environment of tolerance, free from the fear of intimidation, necklacing, murder and other forms of township tyranny. It includes the right to differ from those who preach revolution, armed struggle and mass action and the right to have their views and choices suitably respected. It includes the right to work when others wish to strike; the right to educate children when others wish to burn down the schools; the right to medical care when others wish to shut down the hospitals; and, most importantly in the current context, the right to say no to violence without becoming yet another victim of that violence.

If we are to have peace, we shall have to respect the right of others to differ. This is equally true if we are to have a democracy. Hence, my Government's constitutional proposals are specifically designed to ensure that in the new South Africa, government will be by the consent of the governed; government will be accountable through free and regular elections in a multi-party system on the basis of one person, one vote; and government will be brought closer to the people through the devolution of power to autonomous regions. Human rights will be entrenched in the constitution and be protected by an independent judiciary.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

The impression has been created that my Government is opposed to an interim government and that it favours the writing of a constitution by a body which is not democratically elected. This is not true. My Government, in fact, favours the expeditious establishment of a transitional Government. Such a Government, of course, cannot come about in a constitutional void. A transitional Government requires a transitional constitution. This was and remains our primary objective at CODESA.

As regards the concept of a constituent assembly, my Government has proposed that the final constitution be drawn up by a transitional National Assembly, to be elected on the basis of universal suffrage. During CODESA 2, the Government and various other parties made a major concession to the ANC Communist Party alliance by agreeing that the Senate, the second chamber we have in mind of the transitional parliament, need not participate in the drafting of the final constitution. However, the Government and various other parties strongly support a regional government system based on the concept of federalism, as in countries in Africa. I have heard no one say that the federal system in Nigeria is not democratic; I have heard no one say that the federal system in the United States is not democratic. Our proposal is that agreement must be reached regarding the powers, functions and boundaries of regions and regional Governments prior to the coming into operation of the transitional constitution.

There are an important number of African Heads of State who agreed with me personally when I visited them in their capitals that our proposals are acceptable to them. They told me that in their experience, if you do not allow autonomy to certain regions, you are creating a recipe for bloodshed.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

It has also been alleged that my Government is aiming at a transitional government which would be permanent and which would make it permanently impossible to change the transitional constitution. This is not true. If the transitional constitution has not been replaced within three years - and I say this on record in this Council today - a general election will held. So it is not open-ended. There can be no justification for the claim that our constitutional proposals constitute a desire to cling to power or to entrench a white veto. The whites are not the majority in any of the regions in South Africa, and, as I said earlier, the book on apartheid was closed in the referendum which my Government won on 17 March.

My Government's constitutional proposals are fully in line with the best traditions of free societies and successful modern democracies.

The same should apply to the economy. My Government is committed to a market-orientated economic system that will continue to foster the creative entrepreneurial energies of all our people and create opportunities for prosperity and growth. While my Government recognizes the urgent need to reduce existing backlogs and to alleviate the plight of the underprivileged, it rejects demands based on failed Marxist notions of centralized, command economy policies, nationalization, and investment codes which stifle business activity.

These, in short, are my Government's views on peace, democracy, and prosperity. I think that if South African athletes are to wear armbands, this is what they should say: "Peace, Democracy and Prosperity". That there are differing views and continuing controversies, my Government accepts and welcomes as fundamental to the democratic process. There is a new world in the making. Our people and my Government will be part of this new world.

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

When I addressed this Council on 24 October 1974, I related the story of an African bishop who once compared the blacks and whites in South Africa to a zebra. If the zebra was shot, it would not matter whether the bullet penetrated a white stripe or a black stripe: the whole animal would die. If anything, that anecdote has a more valid message today than ever before.

The Washington Post in its main editorial yesterday wrote:

> "There is growing sentiment for sending a UN fact-finding or goodwill mission to South Africa to help get the peace process back on track. That view warrants support, especially since there is no realistic alternative to the negotiating table. But ultimately the task of curbing the escalating political violence belongs to the South Africans themselves. Only they can create the climate for removing the conditions that foment conflict. And only South Africans - black and white - can determine the pace at which that society is transformed into a practicing democracy. Today's meeting enables the world body and its members to mobilize support for that vital transition."

I associate myself with this incisive analysis.

I would like to close by quoting the last few lines of an Afrikaans poem called "Die Einde" - "The End". It was written by one of our noted Afrikaans poets, a man called C. Louis Leipoldt. It was written in the aftermath of the Anglo-Boer War, with, in the words of the poet, the sound of British cannon-fire still ringing in his ears.

It reads in Afrikaans:

(Mr. Botha, South Africa)

(Spoke in Afrikaans)

"Gee vrede en rus! En ons vra nie iets anders, en luister
Stil na die wind wat so sag in ons ore kom fluister:
'Moed, mense, hou moed:
Die kwaad sal verander in goed -
Die morelig kom uit die duister!'"

(Spoke in English)

A free translation would be:

"Grant us peace and calm! We ask no more, and listen
Quietly to the wind that whispers softly in our ears:
'Courage, friends, hold fast
The bad will turn to good
Out of the darkness comes the dawn!'"

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa for his kind words addressed to me.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Greece, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Exarchos (Greece) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment as President of the Council for the month of July. I should also like to thank you and other members for giving me this opportunity to address the Council on this very important issue in the presence of many African leaders, in particular Mr. Nelson Mandela.

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

I have asked to make a statement to the Council to convey the Malaysian Government's distress and disappointment over the latest developments in South Africa. Since the release of Mr. Mandela from detention there has been a growing feeling of hope and expectation that South Africa is finally turning around, towards the objective of a democratic, non-racial and united country. Indeed, until recently that objective appeared achievable, with encouraging signs emanating from the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) despite incidents of violence and differences between the Administration and the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) over the transitional Government and the future constitution of South Africa. Unfortunately, the serious differences and the violence have persisted, and finally the Boipatong massacre made it impossible for the ANC to continue its participation in CODESA.

The Boipatong massacre came as a shock, and Malaysia joins other members of the international community in condemning the incident and those responsible for it. We fully support the position taken by the ANC and the resolution adopted at the recent meeting of the OAU Council of Ministers held in Dakar, Senegal.

As a member of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Commonwealth Foreign Ministers Committee on South Africa, Malaysia has been following closely the developments in South Africa. Like other members of the international community, we acknowledge the advances that have been made by President De Klerk in dismantling apartheid and moving in the direction of a new South Africa. We are also aware of the internal difficulties faced by

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

President De Klerk, including those coming from extremist elements of the white community and from security elements which for so many years have been used as an instrument of State terror to maintain the repressive apartheid regime.

However, at a point when members of the international community were responding positively to the changes taking place in South Africa, the Boipatong massacre and a series of violent incidents that have taken place in black townships in past years, together with the various problems in the CODESA process, have all combined to raise serious questions about the intention of the South African Administration to pursue the course of peaceful negotiations to end apartheid and build a democratic and non-racial South Africa.

What is clearly needed now is for President de Klerk and his Administration effectively to address and put an end to the problems of violence in the black townships. The situation has reached a point of deterioration where repeated denials of direct responsibility and assurances by the Administration that it will tackle the security problem have lost their credibility. The confidence generated on the basis of the progress achieved at CODESA has been seriously eroded, to the extent that the negotiations are in jeopardy, to the alarm of other African countries and the international community.

President De Klerk and his Administration must come to grips with the deteriorating situation, take action to revive the negotiating process, work within a specified timeframe towards the establishment of a transitional

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

Government acceptable to the black majority, and put an end to the violence. Failure to tackle this dual task would open the Administration to the accusation that it is at the very least tolerating if not collaborating in the violence, that it is not addressing seriously the obstacles to peaceful change, and that what it actually wants is to drag out the process of negotiations and retain its undemocratic hold on power in South Africa, in effect perpetuating minority rule. Despite the changes that have taken place, the black Africans are still suffering, as practices of apartheid and intimidation continue, while socio-economic inequities created by apartheid remain unaddressed. Only with the transition to a majority Government can these grievances be properly addressed and earnest efforts made to bring the black community to an acceptable level of socio-economic existence.

Violence is almost always derived from discontent and distrust, and when the stakes involve one's future, violence can also be an expression of fear. Given the situation in South Africa, such fear provides fertile ground for manipulation by those looking for opportunities to scuttle the CODESA negotiations by turning one group against the other. These elements should not be given the opportunity to do so. Malaysia believes it is vital that the black community find a permanent solution to their problems, to eschew the past, and to close ranks in the negotiating process with the combined weight and strength of their people. CODESA remains a viable mechanism for negotiations on South Africa's future, but CODESA can only be conducted in an atmosphere conducive to negotiations and with the interests of all in view, with clear actions by the South African Administration effectively to curb violence and intimidation.

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

Malaysia supports the draft resolution before the Council calling for the South African authorities to take immediate measures to bring an effective end to the violence in South Africa and to request the Secretary-General to appoint as a matter of urgency a Special Representative in order to recommend, after discussion with the parties concerned, measures which can assist in bringing an effective end to the violence and in creating conditions for negotiations leading towards a peaceful transition to a democratic non-racial South Africa. We believe that the time is right for the United Nations to be tangibly involved in pursuance of the goals set in the 1989 General Assembly consensus resolution on South Africa.

At this critical penultimate stage, the Security Council and the Secretary-General, on behalf of the international community, must be able to take the necessary steps to ensure that the goal of ending apartheid and of instituting a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa is not sacrificed by communal violence or actions of forces opposed to change.

We have heard clearly the appeals from Mr. Mandela and representatives of the OAU on the necessity for a clear United Nations role. Their appeals must be duly answered by the United Nations through the Security Council, which, in keeping with its new-found assertiveness, must now make up for the many years of inadequate attention and response to the situation in South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Malaysia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I am calling upon Mr. Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, who will speak in his personal capacity. This does not in any way entail the recognition by the Council or any of its members of the organization or entity he claims to represent.

I invite Mr. Buthelezi to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BUTHELEZI: I am very pleased to have been afforded an opportunity to address the Security Council on current developments in South Africa. I applaud the decision of the Security Council to give me this opportunity, because it seems to me that it is only fair, when the organization I represent and the people I represent are the subject of discussion both here and in other chambers, that we should be given our democratic right to speak for ourselves.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

At the end of a very long struggle South Africa at last stands on the threshold of a new freedom and democracy. At this moment of transition we face complex challenges for which there has been no real parallel in the world.

We have a white minority racist Government turning its back on its past intentions and genuinely espousing negotiations for a non-racial, non-sexist, open democracy. We also have at least two revolutionary parties returned from exile grappling with the problems of translating their revolutionary drive into a democratic drive. We also have numerous opposition parties which have always opposed apartheid with various tactics and strategies.

Each set of forces in those categories has its own perspective, and each deserves an extensive hearing if members of the Security Council are to arrive at a balanced view of what is actually happening in South Africa. I would welcome any Security Council inquiry into what is happening. The more the world knows about what is really taking place, the more helpful I think the United Nations and the international community will generally be.

I have come to dispel some myths which only I can dispel. The ANC would have it that only it and the South African Government matter when it comes to negotiating a new democracy for South Africa.

Not one single metre of South African territory was liberated by the ANC, primarily because the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the KwaZulu Government, representing the Zulu nation, did not back its revolutionary call. On the other hand, the Government's homeland policy and much of its apartheid structuring had to be abandoned because the IFP, of which I am President, and the KwaZulu Government vehemently rejected apartheid and opposed it every inch of the way. Were it not for the IFP, South Africa would long since have been a Confederation of Southern African States. This would have presented an intractable international problem to the world.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

There will be no solution to the South African problem unless at least the South African Government/National Party and the KwaZulu Government/IFP as well as the ANC Alliance are parties to the solutions attempted.

Any international inquiry of any worth would establish that the IFP has lost over 200 branch and regional office-bearers and over 2,000 ordinary members in the hideous violence that has taken place in the country. However, violence began and, whatever its root cause, all sides are mauled by it and therefore all will have to be party to stopping it.

The claim by the ANC that the South African Government is dominantly the cause of the violence is totally unproven. South Africa was in a state of war, and both insurgency forces and counter-insurgency forces killed in search of political gain or in defence of that which they already had. An independent United Nations fact-finding team would establish this to be so. This Security Council debate on the situation in South Africa suffers grievously because no such inquiry has been made. I appeal to you, Sir, and to all other members of the Security Council to bear this in mind as you consider the arguments and positions put to you.

The first myth to be dispelled is that there is any one-to-one relationship between the process of change taking place in South Africa and what happened in any African country which gained its liberation through a liberation war.

There are no vanquished in South Africa and there are no victors. There are only those who should be equal partners in a negotiation process. Any detailed examination of what actually transpired between CODESA 1 and CODESA 2 would show that a deadlock was reached in CODESA because the ANC failed to gain the support of something like half of all the delegates for its proposals. That is what happened; it was not the Boipatong massacre.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

The harsh reality for the ANC is that it will have to learn that there is a set of black choices in South Africa, that there are those who oppose it and that there are many parties who will not be dictated to by it. It will have to fend for itself as a free political party amongst other political parties if it is to construct a role in the emergence of a new democracy.

I hope to persuade members of the Council that the ANC's withdrawal from CODESA and its adoption of confrontational politics in mass-action programmes are aimed at shaping South African politics to its liking.

The realities are that the Preparatory Committee at the end of last year established CODESA as a negotiation forum, and that forum is still the only negotiation forum in South Africa. We all have our own views of its deficiencies and strengths, but the ANC alone makes out that CODESA is fatally flawed.

The breakdown of negotiations or any lack of clear indication that negotiations are going to succeed, and succeed in a climate of growing hostility, will feed right-wing politics. The ANC will be aware of this. It will therefore be politically advantageous to the ANC to delay progress in CODESA and then come with devastating demands at a time which will leave Mr. De Klerk no recovery time before elections.

Quite clearly, a negotiation crisis which adversely affects the Government will favour mass-action politics and the drumming up of support for ANC demands. We have seen this happening in the present crisis. Right at the outset of assessing the present crisis in this statement, I must state that, as dangerous as this crisis is, it will only be an opening gambit if Mr. De Klerk does not crumble in the face of this first ANC anti-negotiation onslaught.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

Mr. De Klerk will not crumble. I say this not because of any assessment of Mr. De Klerk's strengths or weaknesses, but because in fact the ANC is not confronting Mr. De Klerk; it is confronting a re-institutionalized South Africa, which is driving all political parties before it towards centre-stage politics where negotiations can succeed. The ANC is faced with the reality that as a revolutionized party regarding itself as a government returned from exile it is facing an institutionalized process of socialization.

The ANC is actually driving for its own party political gains, in the presentations it has made to the world generally and to the United Nations in particular.

If the United Nations cannot recognize that revolutionary organizations throughout the world, throughout history, have never been in the habit of attempting to establish political systems which make it possible for other political parties to win elections, we are wasting time.

I want a political system where governments come and go as the electorate appoints and removes them from office. That for me is one of the essentials of democracy. In a very real sense it does not really matter who the first government is after apartheid as long as the electorate has the power and the mechanism to remove unpopular governments from office.

Therefore, the first thing I say to the Security Council is that it must hear what the ANC says as being said by a revolutinoary organization, which, like revolutionary organizations around the world throughout the ages, is interested only in establishing itself as a government returned from exile. Indeed, Mr. Mandela often refers to the ANC as a government in waiting.

The ANC has its own political monster of its own making. For decades it has thrashed South Africans with propaganda assserting that it is the vanguard

(Mr. Buthelezi)

liberation movement, and with the assertion that the only thing worth negotiating about is the handing over of power to the people - that is, handing over power to itself.

There is no need for me to sketch the apartheid society from which our nation has begun to emerge. South Africa is a founder-Member of the United Nations. From its inception the United Nations has had the situation in South Africa inscribed on the agenda of either the General Assembly or the Security Council, to say nothing of United Nations agencies. In other words, the international community is well informed about South Africa. But this very familiarity with the general situation might tend to induce simplistic perceptions of the specifics on the ground within the country.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

South Africa has never been a typical colonial situation. In economic terms, South Africa exhibits the characteristics of both the first world and the third world. The white minority and the black majority are destined to carve out a common destiny in one country. The construction of a non-racial, non-sexist, democratic State will call for reconciliation and statesmanship of the highest order. It is not brinksmanship that is going to do this but statesmanship. It is compromise that will do this. It is give and take.

The response of the South African people to the problems of transition has been heartwarming. There is virtual unanimity on the need to solve the crisis in the country through reconciliation and negotiation. In that regard, one can point to the two main institutions that have emerged in our body politic. I refer to the National Peace Accord, which was signed on 14 September 1991, and the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) established on 20 December 1991.

For decades South Africa has been a country divided unto itself. Violence has become almost a way of life for many. There was the armed struggle waged by the African National Congress (ANC) and other revolutionary parties. Even now the armed struggle is nearly suspended, and I think that the international community should note that. It is merely suspended. So the ANC has always had this second string on its bow of resuming the armed struggle.

Mr. Mandela is not only the founder of the armed struggle, of which UmKhonto weSizwe is the military wing. He is, in fact, the Commander-in-Chief of the military wing of the ANC, UmKhonto weSizwe, and only a few months ago he was in Uganda wearing military fatigues talking to some people in their camps in Uganda, as the Commander-in-Chief of the military wing, of UmKhonto weSizwe.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

There was the reaction of the authorities who saw this struggle for freedom of the oppressed people as part of an internationally sponsored total onslaught on South Africa. There were parties which never went into exile and which had to find other strategies and tactics with which to oppose apartheid within South Africa.

There was also internecine and fratricidal violence between those who differed from one another politically and in terms of method and on tactics. We have never differed with the ANC/SACP alliance on the objectives of the struggle. In fact, it seems to me that people have short memories because all along I have had a very good relationship with Mr. Tambo. I met with Mr. Tambo in London; I met with him in Stockholm; I met him in Lagos; and we met in Malawi; we met in Nairobi; and we met throughout the years until 1979. There was no problem between us, and even after I founded the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), there was this good relationship.

Let alone to talk about Mr. Mandela himself. Mr. Mbegi is here. In fact, in the mid-1970s he came to Heathrow Airport and said to me "we are allies". We regarded ourselves as allies, even though I had founded the Inkatha Freedom Party. But we wanted to do in tandem those things that it was possible to do.

I actually took a delegation to London in 1979 where we had a two-and-a-half-day discussion with the delegation led by Mr. Tambo, the then President of the ANC in exile, when we talked for two-and-one-half days on the struggle in South Africa; and it was clear that we differed on two things: one, we differed on the use of violence - we could not embrace that - and, secondly, nor could we embrace sanctions.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

To talk about Mr. Mandela is very emotional, for our relationship is not only political, or just between colleagues, but there are family relationships, and throughout his incarceration in jail we corresponded. Up to the time he was released he corresponded with me. In fact, one of the first people that he telephoned after he was released was myself. He did so to say that he wanted to come and see me in my home. He also wanted me to make arrangements for him to see the King of the Zulus, to which I agreed. But later, as there was an eruption of violence in Pietermaritzburg, he then requested me to go with him there to address a joint peace rally of our followers, and I agreed with alacrity.

But the problem is that a few days before we were due to go there, I received word that Mr. Mandela was no longer going there, and I telephoned him. He then told me that Mr. Harry Gwala, who is a hard-line Stalinist in my part of the world, had led a delegation of about 100 people to the office of the ANC in Johannesburg and had told Mr. Mandela that he should not go with me to address the joint peace rally because if that happened there would be a blood bath.

I disagreed that there would be any such bloodbath. But, in fact, some chiefs in Umthata, when Mr. Mandela visited Umthata later on, asked him why the meeting had not taken place and Mr. Mandela himself explained to the chiefs that he could not see me because some members of the ANC had throttled him - he used the word "throttled".

The decades-long cycle of violence and conflict was broken by the fundamental change of policy enunciated by the State President, Mr. De Klerk, in the South African Parliament on 2 February 1990. This meant that for the first time in the 80-year history of the South African State, the conflict

(Mr. Buthelezi)

between black and white would henceforth be resolved through reconciliation and negotiation.

The De Klerk speech was a victory for all the people of South Africa. As members of the Council know, victory has many generals. Many now unilaterally claim that the historic De Klerk speech was the result of the efforts of this or that organization. We do not agree. The progress that has been made in the drive towards democracy in South Africa is the work of many hands over many generations.

On my own behalf, and that of the KwaZulu Government, I wish once again to point out the historical fact that the biggest national group in South Africa, the largest nation in South Africa, the Zulu nation, refused to accept "grand apartheid". This was a fundamental reason for the failure of the attempt to turn parts of South Africa into zones in which the white minority would be dominant.

For years I personally, on behalf of my Government and on behalf of all the people of South Africa, refused to enter into any negotiations with successive Governments, unless and until Mr. Nelson Mandela was released, the ANC and other organizations unbanned and exiles allowed to return home. People have short memories and now seek to denigrate the efforts of KwaZulu and the Inkatha Freedom Party in the fight for freedom.

I say all this because there seems to be a perception that the age-old struggle between black and white has now become a struggle for power between the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) of which I am President. The IFP, which is a signatory to the National Peace Accord, has never had a policy of fomenting violence against anybody. If the IFP actively incited the Zulu nation against its political opponents, the situation in South Africa would been been quite different, quite chaotic. The truth is that we, as leaders,

(Mr. Buthelezi)

have been engaged in a constant campaign to restrain our followers, who have been the victims of attacks by organizations which for decades have had violence as part and parcel of their policies.

The tragedy is that the hideous massacres caused in Boipatong was overlaid with gleeful exploitative action from some quarters. There was what I can only call a veritable orgy of propaganda in which the South African Government and the IFP were blamed for the violence that took place. In fact, members of the IFP were killed in Boipatong. In fact, some members of the IFP were buried as members of the ANC in that big funeral that took place. They were buried as members of the ANC because they died in that massacre.

International television was there, church figures, such as Archbishop Tutu were there, making political speech after political speech, aimed at incitement and the destruction of the climate for negotiations.

I should like to say that the violence, unlike what the representative of Lesotho stated, did not begin in Natal KwaZulu. It started in 1984 in the Vaal Triangle - where it is hottest even now - where Boipatong is situated. It has always been a difficult area. The first black violence took place there in 1984, when a black councillor, Mr. Jacob Dlamini, was incinerated in his car, for no reason other than that he was a councillor, and therefore a "collaborator" in the eyes of those who killed him. There was broadcast after broadcast from Radio Freedom in Lusaka by the ANC asking young people to band themselves together and kill all those whom they designated as collaborators.

For decades South Africa has been a country divided unto itself. Violence has become almost a way of life for many in South Africa. There was the so-called armed struggle which, as I have stated, was waged by the ANC and other revolutionary organizations. There was the reaction of the authorities,

(Mr. Buthelezi)

who said that the struggle for freedom of the oppressed people was a Soviet-sponsored one in support of total onslaught on South Africa - that was the official view. There were other parties, such as the Inkatha Freedom Party, when it was still the Inkatha Cultural Liberation Movement, which did not go into exile, as I say, and had to find other strategies and tactics with which to oppose apartheid. There was also the internicine and fratricidal violence, which I have mentioned.

In other words, the picture in reality is far more complex than that presented by those who seek to produce a doctored version of the history of our country in the last few years. On behalf of the Inkatha Freedom Party, I wish categorically to reject any attempt to paint the ANC and the other organizations as white knights in shining armour who have never soiled their hands with coercion, intimidation and violence.

The ANC has a military wing, as I stated, called UmKhonto weSizwe, consisting of thousands of people who have received training in the former Soviet Union and other collapsed Eastern European regimes. The organization is in control of vast arms caches of modern weapons, including the notorious AK-47 rifles.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

We are compelled to negotiate with an ANC which adamantly refuses to halt recruitment and the military training of its members. Since February 1990, thousands of militarily trained members of UmKhonto weSizwe have been released from prisons; they have returned from exile and are now in South Africa. My people are being killed by operatives of Umkhonto weSizwe. These people cannot suddenly transform themselves into peaceful canvassers for democratic elections. They are shock troops who coerce and intimidate everyone who refuses to carry out ANC orders and to accept ANC policies.

The reason the Inkatha Freedom Party has incurred the wrath of the ANC, and has thus been subjected to venomous propaganda attacks such as we saw yesterday, is precisely because it is the only political formation capable of halting, independently of the South African Government, any attempt by the ANC to seize power unconstitutionally. Inkatha is the only party that can resist the coercion and intimidation of its members, though at great cost to us.

Our opponents realize that Inkatha stands as a bar to any attempt to establish an undemocratic one-party State in South Africa in place of the present apartheid State. Inkatha also makes any deal between the ANC and the Government at the expense of democracy unlikely to succeed. The grotesque propaganda strategy in which a party with a massive arsenal of modern Soviet weapons pleads for the disarming of ordinary Zulu people, who have traditionally carried spears, sticks and shields, is eloquent testimony of the extent to which unreality has become the norm in our country.

I have stated over and over again that I support the prohibition of carrying dangerous weapons in public. However, there are some things which are just accoutrements of the Zulu people. We have traditional accoutrements such as my stick, which I am carrying here and which I will carry to the end of my days. It is a cultural thing of my people. I have never seen people -

(Mr. Buthelezi)

for example, in a parade, soldiers or police - with swords butchering anyone. The thing we should deal with in South Africa is the culture of violence. You can use a woman's shoe to kill people. It is the culture of violence that all of us in South Africa must deal with.

I would like to ask the permission of the President to distribute copies of a text which I have already sent to him by fax for the information of members. I do not want to dwell on this issue now. The text offers more information on the issues that I have mentioned. I will distribute copies if members wish - unless, of course, they do not want to be confused by the truth or by the facts.

With respect to the incident that was cited twice here by both the President of ANC and the President of PAC about the training of the 200 Zulus, what happened at that time is that Mr. Derek Lionel, a leader of UmKhonto weSizwe, the military wing of the ANC in Swaziland, was preparing a hit squad to come and kill me and my colleagues and to destroy buildings, because I did not accept so-called independence.

I have no army; the Zulus have no army at all. Therefore, the Commissioner of Police decided to get 200 Zulus to train in the VIP protective services. He then took those people to the military to train them for us in VIP protective services. We then integrated them into the KwaZulu police, and some of them were given to us to look after ministers, myself, our buildings and so forth. The Goldstone Commission is now actually conducting an inquiry. I am surprised that people who are lawyers and legal-minded people should talk about something that is still being inquired into by the Goldstone Commission, saying that those people are members of hit squads. This is exactly what the Goldstone Commission is now going to ascertain.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

The bias in the South African media is unbelievable. The star witness in this case, Gunsi Khumalo, who said that we are hit squads, was completely discredited by the advocate who represented us. He admitted that in fact he was lying and that he had never seen any training of such hit squads. That is the red herring that the President of the ANC and the President of PAC have injected into this discussion.

There is also a double standard in this case because there are some people coming into Transkei who have been arrested by the Transkei police. They were carrying lists of some of the leaders of the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and were coming to kill them. One of them had an identification which showed that some members of the Umkhonto weSizwe, the military wing of the ANC, had already been integrated into the Transkei army. There are double standards here, because the head of the Transkei was trained by the South African Defence Force, as was the army of the Transkei.

Then there is the issue of hostels. I want to state that hostels, where black males are singly housed, are part and parcel of South Africa's indefensible past. They are part of the migratory labour system which was forced on black South Africans by various white regimes, including the apartheid regime. In the past, the South African Government did not allow black workers to bring their wives and children with them to their places of work. One Deputy Minister, Mr. Froneman, once described black women and children as "superfluous appendages".

There are, however, hundreds of thousands of black workers who have no intention of bringing their wives or families with them to the cities. These people will need single quarters for the foreseeable future. It is also our position that half the black population of South Africa consists of people who are only 15 years of age or younger. So we have a very young population which

(Mr. Buthelezi)

will also need decent single quarters for a very long time. But many of the hostels have not been attended to for many years and are therefore not fit for human occupation. They need to be upgraded and made decent for those who use them.

We in the IFP have no objection if some of the hostels are converted into family units. But there is no doubt that many of our people will want to use this sort of accommodation for many years to come.

The KwaMadala hostel which has been in the news after the Boipatong tragedy has, for the last few years, become a desperate refuge for people. That is, men, women and children who have fled from the endemic violence in the Vaal Triangle. These are people whose homes have been gutted and whose lives have been traumatized by the death of their loved ones by hideous violence. We had a good example of the cruel manner in which a supposed member of the Inkatha Freedom Party was hacked to death in front of all the cameras of the world, in front of a throng of people on the day of the funeral in Boipatong, in front of the top leadership of the ANC, and was burned in front of all them. The people at KwaMadala hostel are frightened and are seeking an alternative to life in that area because they have to live under the threat of violence all the time.

I am not making a statement of culpability of the KwaMadala inmates. I am not one of those who blame a whole hostel if some of the criminals in its midst do horrible things. I am just referring to the unhelpful habit of some people who, before they have the facts of a matter, rush off to apportion blame to all the inmates of that hostel.

I want to pause here to bring the Goldstone Commission into perspective, as I see it. Last year, there were multi-party negotiations which culminated in the National Peace Convention at which the National Peace Accord was signed

(Mr. Buthelezi)

on 14 September 1991. Even on that occasion the President of ANC stated to Mr. De Klerk that he had no intention of dismantling UmKhonto weSizwe, the military wing of ANC, before the ink was dry after the signing. This Peace Accord established various mechanisms to combat violence. One of these mechanisms was the Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Intimidation. Quite clearly the Goldstone Commission is only at the beginning of its work. Ever since the National Peace Convention, violence in the last year has continued to escalate and has now reached crisis proportions.

By its very nature, we face the reality that the Goldstone Commission's terms of reference precluded it from making assessments of the relative value of political parties and their contribution to the peace process. It is also precluded from going back beyond 1989, when, in fact, it was in the late 1970s and early 1980s that the foundation was laid for the current violence in South Africa. It was during those times that ANC issued statements for internal consumption stating that Buthelezi was not a puppet of the regime, but a counterrevolutionary, and that they must work on him to deprive him of his base. Some of the top members of ANC said that Buthelezi was a snake that poisoned South Africa - "we must hit him on the head". That was the forecast.

This specific focus of the Goldstone Commission must be taken into account when its findings are used as input assessments of the culpability of the South African Government and of any political party for the current impasse in negotiations.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

We appreciate the privilege of being able for the first time, in keeping with the audi alteram partem principle, to put across our own point of view in this United Nations forum. And I want to emphasize that one can send many delegations to Africa, either the Organization of African Unity or yourselves, but as long as there is a partisan stance, from which you just listen to one side and not to other parties, you never resolve the problem; in fact you exacerbate it.

The Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) has made representations to the National Peace Committee set up by the National Peace Accord to include the monitoring of the policies and strategies of the political parties which are signatories to the Accord. We want more than the actual investigation of specific incidents of violence. Past revolutionary propaganda and current revolutionary activity need to be brought into focus if we are ever going to come to grips with the real causes of violence.

We of the IFP do not have the resources, the people, the money or the diplomatic support to dominate both South African and international media when it comes to violence in South Africa. In my package you will find, if you accept it, articles by two very senior journalists who point out this bias as far as the IFP is concerned.

The whole world has heard of Boipatong because it has been given effective and proper coverage. Thirty-nine people died in a hideous attack on the Boipatong community. In April this year, only a matter of weeks ago, a similar attack took place at Crossroads squatter camp in the East Rand. Twenty-five members of the IFP were attacked and people lost their lives in an orgy of nocturnal violence, which - like the Boipatong violence - took the lives of women and even babies.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

I can mention many other massacres. In some cases South African police were implicated, and were in cahoots with members of the UDF. They killed members of the IFP in massacres where youths were killed; 13 youths were killed in Ngwatshan. I can mention cases where a number of people have been similarly killed.

But there was no equivalent outcry to what there is now in Boipatong because it was Inkatha Freedom Party members who died, and because the IFP did not have the resources to publicize the event as it should have been publicized, and becauses bodies like the OAU and yourselves have never given us a chance to speak for ourselves. We do not say that we want to make propaganda here; we want to speak, as I am doing, so that you hear all sides and then make up your own minds. The publicity that ensued in Boipatong was generated by those who have the resources to generate it, and who have the international connections that we don't have.

I believe that it is wrong for the South African Government to talk only to the ANC about CODESA, outside of CODESA. If this is encouraged, CODESA will suffer what will perhaps turn out to be irreversible damage. The promotion of the perception that these constitutional matters about the future of the country can be sorted out on a bi-polar basis, by only the ANC and the South African Government, is the very thing that is bound to widen cleavages that exist. These in turn fan the flames of violence. With all due respect, the Government and the ANC will never be able to solve the problem of violence nor of negotiations by themselves.

South Africa is a multi-racial country. The ethnology of South Africa is such that you need to handle things with care. We would welcome a very strong and effective international fact-finding mission charged with the task of

(Mr. Buthelezi)

researching the origins of violence and monitoring the current violence in order to present a more objective and non-partisan picture in place of the present charges and counter-charges which have bedevilled the negotiation process in our country.

It is no use for the President of the ANC to come here to quote so-called cases, because some of the members of the board in question are ANC members, including Mrs. Sisulu; something like that is not impartial in any sense. There are organizations with some innocuous-looking names in South Africa, such as the Human Rights Lawyers and the Legal Resources Centre, which are all operations fronting for the ANC and which then issue these reports. When the International Commission of Jurists came, they sucked all this information from them - all this poison about us - and spread it all over the world.

Side by side with the means employed to end conflict and violence have been the negotiations for a new constitution for South Africa. Unlike all previous experiences in Africa, this is a constitution that has to satisfy the aspirations not only of the black majority but also of the substantial white minority.

Most of the independence constitutions of Africa were negotiated at all-party constitutional conferences at which consensus, and not voting, was the method used to arrive at decisions. Thus the constitutions became the common property of all those who had a hand in the negotiations. The history of the last 30 years in Africa has shown that the adoption of constitutions by consensus did not necessarily guarantee their longevity. Nevertheless, they had better promise than constitutions born ln conflict.

The Inkatha Freedom Party was of the view that an all-inclusive constitutional conference uniting all the parties with a proven constituency,

(Mr. Buthelezi)

together with traditional kings, rulers and chiefs as well as Governments, as happened with all the former colonies of Britain, would be the best forum for negotiating a democratic constitution for South Africa.

The Convention for a Democratic South Africa as presently constituted has gone a long way towards achieving our ideal of an all-inclusive constitutional preparatory body. We thought it was flawed, of course, because it excluded the Zulu nation, the largest nation in South Africa. You see, the Zulu people see themselves as a target, because in July 1990 the ANC, the South African Communist Party, the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) organized throughout the country a stay-away which was meant to pressure the South African Government into dismantling KwaZulu. KwaZulu is not a construct of apartheid, as you know: Kwazulu is a sovereign nation, a kingdom. We have a king even now, like Lesotho and Swaziland. In fact, the most eminent of them all, as history will record, are the only ones that are sealed out.

The Xhosas of Transkei are represented by a Government of Xhosa people. The Xhosas of Ciskei are represented by a Government of Xhosas from Ciskei. The Vendas of Venda are represented by a Government of Vendas. The people of Bophuthatswana are represented by the Government of Bophuthatswana. But not so for the largest nation of all, the Zulus. There cannot be peace.

CODESA was also boycotted by some important players such as the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), the Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO) and the Conservative Party. We have always tried to urge them to participate in CODESA. Despite these flaws, the IFP decided to participate fully, whilst reserving its position regarding the composition of CODESA.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

As we see it, the negotiations at CODESA have been bedevilled by the demand that the constitution-making body to draw up a constitution should take decisions by a two-thirds majority. In other words, it is envisaged by some delegates that a constitution opposed by the representatives of fully a third of South Africa's population could achieve stability and peace in the country. When it is considered that this means approximately 12 million people out of a population of 37 million, it will be realized that this approach poses serious problems for the makers of a democratic constitution for South Africa. It has nothing to do with Boipatong.

I do not wish to bore representatives with the minutiae of the constitutional negotiations at CODESA. I cite the example above because its advocates claim that they are acting in terms of the Harare Declaration, which laid down the steps to be followed in constitution-making in South Africa. In other words, we have delegates to the CODESA talks who feel rigidly bound by decisions taken outside the country. They claim that it is a universal rule that constitutions are adopted by a two-thirds majority throughout the world. This seems to confuse the original adoption of a constitution with the provisions for amendment contained in the constitution of a country. The pre-determining of a system of checks and balances was all that the controversy was about. It was not about Boipatong at all. It was not about the white minority veto at all. This is absolutely false.

There is no viable substitute for a negotiating body such as CODESA. Much was achieved at CODESA, including transitional arrangements for ensuring free and fair elections, an interim government and a constitution-making body to draw up a final constitution for South Africa.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

South Africa is a sovereign independent State and a Member of the United Nations. I do not know how South Africa will react to the resolutions placed before this body. All I can say is that the KwaZulu Government on the one hand and the Inkatha Freedom Party on the other would welcome and cooperate with any special representative charged with the task of investigating in depth the origins and underlying causes of the violence which has now become endemic in our country, with a view to recommending measures to bring the violence to an end. We also have no serious objection to the establishment of some monitoring machinery to observe, on a continuous basis, developments in South Africa and to make recommendations.

I must, however, sound a note of warning. Whatever international presence is envisaged would exacerbate the situation if it was perceived to be designed to buttress the position of any party or group of parties to the internal political conflict. Already there has been a fierce and long-standing propaganda war which has been waged by the various parties in South Africa.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

This propaganda war has aligned people on one side or the other on the basis not of facts, evidence or reality, but on media image and perception. It is absolutely vital that any investigation should penetrate beneath the crust of propaganda that has already formed around certain events in our country and establish the facts of the situation objectively and impartially. That would obviously enhance the task of mediation and conciliation intended to end conflict and foster the negotiation process.

I should also make it clear that in the present circumstances, nothing in the nature of peace-keeping with security or military forces is called for. We would be opposed to such intervention not only in principle but because it would blight the chances of a solution fashioned by the people of South Africa themselves. Any solution which appeared to be imposed, given the history of our country, would have little chance of success.

I have refrained from turning the proceedings of this august body into a propaganda terrain reflecting the internal struggles in South Africa. For every allegation of so-called fact, the IFP could reply with counter-allegations. This would, I believe, pre-empt the investigation and monitoring function which the Security Council and the Secretary-General are being asked to establish

I have, however, requested the President to circulate to all representatives various documents, including an analysis of the presentation of violence in South Africa to the international community; the National Peace Accord; and a brief on why negotiations ground to a halt. These documents are obviously written from the perspective of the Inkatha Freedom Party and from the perspective of the KwaZulu Government. But they do constitute basic material to assist any international investigation.

(Mr. Buthelezi)

South Africa is going through a difficult period in its path to a new non-racial democratic order. We are engaged in a great and noble cause aimed at replacing a racist apartheid system with a non-racial democratic society. It is in many ways a unique endeavour. The communities we are trying to unite in a common destiny belong to the first world and the third world. We are a microcosm of one of the great dilemmas of our time, that of bridging the historic and cultural gap between white and black, between the West and Africa.

Mr. Mandela, at his first rally in Durban on 25 February 1990, acknowledged in front of a concourse of people that he appreciated the role that I had played in securing his release. I had refused to negotiate with the regime until he was released, and that is a fact. One of Mr. De Klerk's famous speeches was delivered in the South African Parliament on 2 July. I was the only leader among many who helped him reach that point, and indeed, he specifically mentioned that I had helped him arrive at the stage of abolishing apartheid.

I and my Party, the Inkatha Freedom Party, are optimistic that South Africa will meet the challenge and come up to expectations. The international community played a major role in the fight against apartheid, which we very much appreciate. It can make a constructive contribution towards enabling the people of South Africa to achieve their destiny of building a democratic and prosperous future, not only for South Africa, but for Africa as a whole.

Finally, I should like to add that, if sanctions are kept in place, violence will not stop in South Africa. Just before I left, a delegation of both Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking representatives came to see me

(Mr. Buthelezi)

after having seen Mr. De Klerk. They were due in a few days' time to see the President of ANC, Mr. Mandela. They told me that there is no new investment, either local or international, and that the economy is in dire straits. What do we see in all this? The ANC/SACP alliance is planning stay-aways, beginning next month, from August to December. These stay-aways are always conducted through intimidation and violence. They are planning, among other things, a national consumer boycott - action with the specific demand that they must support the process of democracy in peace. In these consumer boycotts, old women are sometimes made to drink cooking oil and detergents. Marches through the homes of those security-force personnel implicated in the violence should take place; more trials should be held for people in different areas; campaigns to restore citizenship to all homeland people should be undertaken; occupation of Bophutatswana and Ciskei offices; a march through the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly.

If that is not a recipe for violence and bloodshed, then I do not know what is.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Buthelezi for his kind words addressed to me.

Without trampling on the right of any speaker to say at length what he or she wishes to say, I should appreciate it if the following speakers were to be as brief as possible.

The next speaker is Mr. Lucas M. Mangope, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I am calling on Mr. Mangope, who will speak in his personal capacity. This does not in any way entail the recognition by the Council or any of its members of the organization or entity he claims to represent. I invite Mr. Mangope to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MANGOPE: I should like to thank the members of the Council and the Organization of African Unity for providing us with the opportunity to help broaden your understanding of the situation as it pertains to southern Africa today.

One of southern Africa's greatest statesmen, General Jannie Smuts, who ironically played no small part in the conceptualization and founding of the League of Nations, later to become the United Nations, must this day be convulsing in his grave.

As people in South Africa proceed to kill each other by the thousands by means so barbaric as to be unspeakable, one is forced to speculate on how the founders of the United Nations would have reacted.

Seen against the background of the present mindless violence and killings in South Africa, and that country's recent history, which will be eternally blighted as a result of its inhuman apartheid policies, no one could be blamed for being deeply concerned about the country and its apparent headlong flight to self-destruction.

It is a tragic irony that for more than 300 years black South Africans have struggled for freedom and the restoration of their dignity, with many paying the ultimate price. Now, just as it would seem that we are approaching the realization of that dream, the unthinkable is happening and all is being put needlessly at risk.

South Africa can be likened in microcosm to the macro-situation prevailing in Europe after the two great wars, and more recently after the collapse of communism.

In those times of need, men of vision emerged to fashion order from chaos and to restore national pride and industriousness where there was only dejection and apathy.

(Mr. Mangope)

We in Bophuthatswana remain steadfastly optimistic about the future of our region, for the very simple reason that we are living proof that the people of our region have what it takes to rise from the ashes of near-extinction and succeed where others thought we would fail.

My people, the Batswana people who speak the Setswana language, have known betrayal, subjugation, fragmentation, loss of identity and dignity, and the inhumanity of apartheid.

My people occupied what could be generally described as the north-western area of South Africa from the beginnings of their history and certainly long before the appearance of the first white man. In 1871, the British formally and legally recognized our sovereignty in terms of the now infamous Keate Award of that year.

Our forefathers were deeply concerned that they would lose their land, their freedom and their sovereignty if British and Boer expansionism in the region was not checked. They were led to believe that the Keate Award was the answer to their fears, and they accepted its validity in good faith. After all, it was backed by the might of the British Empire and the monarchy.

(Mr. Mangope)

But within months of the award the British had reneged on it, and it was not worth the paper on which it was written. Our worst fears were realized. Our land, known as British Bechuanaland, was annexed to the Cape Colony in 1895, while the rest of the land of our forefathers would, with the stroke of a pen in Whitehall, become what is today the independent State of Botswana.

What followed is well documented. The Batswana of what had been British Bechuanaland - today, our country Bophuthatswana - were systematically dispossessed of their land and their rights by both the British and the Boers. Our people were fragmented and scattered willy-nilly across the subcontinent. Our culture, our language, the very fabric of our being as a people, began to be dissipated and lost in a bastardized tapestry - a situation exacerbated by the evils of apartheid.

But through it all there remained in our souls the flickering flame of nationhood, which no amount of abuse or inhumanity could extinguish. Feeding this flame, maintaining this light was the one underpinning fact of our existence, which no man-made philosophy or ideology could shake. This was our unwavering faith in God Almighty: that He in His infinite wisdom would ultimately show His hand in determining our destiny.

This, we believe, occurred in 1977, when we finally achieved our independence from South Africa and began the monumental task of rebuilding our nation literally from scratch. Since then we have confounded our critics with our success, and we continue to do so.

We maintained in 1977, and we maintain today, that we are not, as our critics at home would have the world believe, a child of apartheid. I want to emphasize that we are not a creation of apartheid. We effectively used the

(Mr. Mangope)

apartheid policy to begin claiming back that which was rightfully ours, and which had been wrongfully taken from us.

In the past 14 years, through a vigorous policy of free enterprise, enlightened economic policies and less rather than more government, we have become one of the sole beacons of light on the otherwise dark continent of Africa. Our successes are a matter of record, and all was achieved in the absence of access to the usual international sources of development funding, and without any humanitarian aid whatsoever.

To crown it all, we have become a haven of stability to which South Africans are fleeing in large numbers on a daily basis to avoid the violence and uncertainty of the conditions in their own country. The misery of these poor souls is too profound to describe, and we are doing everything within our means to assist them.

There are many factors which have contributed to the Bophuthatswana success story, not least of which is the political and industrial stability we have enjoyed since independence 14 years ago.

However, I have the unenviable task of reporting to the Council today that the dark thunderclouds of unrest and violence which cover neighbouring South Africa at present are, almost inevitably, beginning to obscure the sunlight of stability and progress to which Bophuthatswana has become accustomed. While Bophuthatswana has thus far largely been spared the violence currently sweeping South Africa, we know that plans for mass action, strikes and boycotts in Bophuthatswana are well advanced.

While it is not my intention today to indulge in a counter-productive finger-pointing exercise aimed at apportioning blame for the present state of

(Mr. Mangope)

affairs, there are certain home truths which must go on record as far as Bophuthatswana is concerned.

It is an unfortunate matter of record in our country that the African National Congress has, as official policy, the aim of destabilizing Bophuthatswana with the objective of creating a climate of ungovernability in order to install an administration to its liking. This was officially confirmed once again at no less a gathering than the African National Congress national policy conference held in May of this year.

I speak here not of hearsay or speculation. It is fact. Prominent African National Congress leaders have on various occasions alluded to these plans in public, most recently in a despicable attack by an African National Congress leader who promised the use of the hideous necklace method of political assassination to ensure my party's removal from government.

Our underpinning philosophy has been, and remains, the belief that the problems of our region are going to be solved nowhere other than at the negotiation table. We are historically a non-violent nation and everything we have achieved to date has been via the process of civilized discourse and negotiation.

In February this year Mr. Mandela of the African National Congress travelled to our capital, Mmabatho, for discussions with my Government and me on the prevailing situation. During our lengthy meeting, Mr. Mandela thanked me for my repeated insistence during his years of imprisonment that he should be released and his organization unbanned in South Africa. He also acknowledged the fact that the African National Congress had never been banned or restricted in Bophuthatswana.

(Mr. Mangope)

It was during this meeting that Mr. Mandela, when confronted with the evidence, gave his personal assurance that the African National Congress would cease forthwith its orchestrated programme of destabilization in Bophuthatswana.

I am disappointed to have to report that for reasons best known to the African National Congress this undertaking was not complied with.

For our part we have stated repeatedly that the African National Congress is not, and never has been, banned in Bophuthatswana. Provided the African National Congress meets the simple and universally accepted requirement to register as a political party and thereby become accountable for its actions and utterances, it will have the democratic right to operate in Bophuthatswana without hindrance.

Irrefutable information at our disposal, coupled with the recent utterances and actions of the African National Congress and its allies and front organizations, indicates that, if anything, the destabilization campaign against Bophuthatswana has been stepped up. We are in possession of proof that the African National Congress is pursuing a double agenda, which involves negotiating on the one hand and, on the other, wholesale destabilization of institutions and individuals with which it disagrees.

It is regrettable that an organization which was jointly responsible for the wording of the CODESA declaration of intent and the peace accord, and which is a signatory of both these documents, can persist with its destabilization campaign by way of mass action, intimidation, strikes and covert plots. In our part of the world, these lead almost inevitably to confrontation, violence, arson and horrendous loss of life.

(Mr. Mangope)

With this in mind it is worth noting that many of us firmly believe that the African National Congress decision to walk out of CODESA and launch its mass-action programme was made some time before CODESA 2 even convened. Remember that we are an integral part of CODESA, including its management committee.

It was incomprehensible to us that, despite the fact that the CODESA management committee met several times after the CODESA 2 deadlock, the African National Congress failed to raise or pursue the very issues over which it is now embarking on mass action. These issues were, after all, on the agenda of each of the subsequent meetings, but the African National Congress delegation all but ignored them.

Irresponsible use of the emotions of the masses, such as we are experiencing at the moment, will do nought for our progress towards true democracy, and will hasten the headlong plunge to anarchy and hopelessness.

For its part, Bophuthatswana has made, and stands ready to continue making, a constructive contribution to the resolution of the serious problems of our region. We were invited to participate in deliberations at CODESA and did so very willingly. We were, and remain, convinced that we have an extremely meaningful contribution to make. Bophuthatswana has a lot to share by way of hard-earned experience which has resulted in the many successes we can boast of today.

We humbly and sincerely submit that if the Council wishes to see and experience what a near-ideal future South Africa could be like, both in terms of development and inter-racial harmony, it should visit and experience Bophuthatswana today. I humbly and sincerely extend an invitation to the Council to do so, just as we have extended an invitation to the Organization of African Unity.

(Mr. Mangope)

For many years now we have been convinced that the only viable solution to the problems of our region would be the adoption of a confederal system, with the closest possible economic ties between the constituent sovereign elements in such a system.

But, irrespective of what emerges at the end of the negotiation process, our overriding consideration will always be to make our recommendations based on what we believe to be in the best interests of our people, and then to ask the people themselves to make the final decision.

Finally, I want to propose today that all southern African leaders put aside self-interest and power politics and that we meet head-on our responsibility to end the chaos and misery through reasoned negotiation. I appeal to the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole to use their considerable influence to endorse this proposal. It is the right and just way forward; it is the responsible way forward; it is the only way forward. The alternative is too ghastly to contemplate.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Brigadier Oupa J. Gqozo, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I am giving the floor to Brigadier Oupa J. Gqozo, who will speak in his personal capacity. This does not in any way entail the recognition by the Council or any of its members of the organization or entity he claims to represent. I invite Brigadier Gqozo to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GQOZO: I should like first to thank the Council very much and to extend my country's appreciation for the invitation to be heard in the Council. It is indeed appreciated, Mr. President, that in your wisdom, in your leadership of the Council, you have seen fit and deemed it necessary that

(Mr. Gqozo)

some other parties that are a reality in South Africa should also be heard, irrespective of their recognition by the Council. We thank you, Sir.

The truth about South Africa has to be told. Failure to understand the realities can and will lead to disaster for the whole African continent.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am here today to tell you the truth. Even as much as a word deviating from the truth would be an injustice to the people in my part of the world.

I am particularly conscious of Senator Bradley's words at the Democratic Party convention here in New York earlier this week:

> "At another time in our history, Martin Luther King Junior wrote from his jail cell that 'We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of bad people, but for the silence of good people'."

I do not wish to repent for remaining silent.

The truth is that political violence and cruel intimidation stalk South Africa day and night.

It is important to know some historical facts. First, during the 1950s the African National Congress was a genuine liberation movement - I repeat "genuine". It fought against oppressive laws, rules and regulations of apartheid.

But this apartheid is coming to an abrupt end, and it is history. That cannot be denied, even by implacable enemies of the system, like us as well, as South Africans, black South Africans.

But the ANC continues the struggle, conducting 1950 politics, revenge politics, which means violence, intimidation and disruption of people's daily lives, with its negative consequences on the country's economy. We can never

(Mr. Ggozo)

hope to contribute positively to a liberated future when we refuse to let go of the enslaved past. We must all be liberated in our minds first.

Those committed to change in South Africa have not yet realized, either deliberately or influenced by ANC propaganda, that they are already liberated. Political parties and organizations which were proscribed are now free to operate almost at will.

Because of this unrealistic attitude and refusal to accept the present situation, which is in their eventual favour, 36 million people are suffering needlessly, and ANC policies and demands are being backed by States and Governments outside the borders of South Africa. Why?

It is just not true that the National Party, under President De Klerk, represents all whites. And it is ridiculous and irresponsible to suggest - and even worse to believe - that the ANC alone represents black political aspirations in South Africa.

The continual selective reporting and a merciless propaganda machine have convinced even responsible Governments that the ANC represents all black people in South Africa. It is just not true.

Over the years many political groups have mushroomed in South Africa. That is reality. Nineteen are represented at the CODESA negotiations, which have received world-wide publicity. That is reality. Many other groups are not at these negotiations. Nevertheless, the truth is that these groups not at CODESA represent people, and this is what the United Nations is all about - people and their right to live in peace on planet Earth.

(Mr. Ggozo)

And yet the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) adopts a pseudo-sense of superiority that presupposes a right to negotiate on behalf of all others. They forget that in terms of the Declaration of Intent signed at CODESA they are equal participants in the constitutional process and no more. They have no justification for any other belief.

The ANC propagates a perception that they will be a future Government. This is presumptuous. When they do not get their own way, the ANC resorts to violence in order to save face in front of their international supporters whom they have misled. Their activities and attitude are no longer those of a progressive liberation movement but of an oppressive movement bent on seizing power by revolutionary means. Their only interest is just the transfer of power from white to black, which ceases to be a realistic proposition. It becomes racial.

South Africa has 10 homelands. Whether they are recognized internationally or not is beside the point. They exist. They are there with millions of people within their borders.

Six of these homelands are self-governing. Again, if this is not believed by some or all, it is denying existing facts. Four of these States are politically independent and autonomous, like my country Ciskei. They await the day they can take their place alongside the new South Africa which is painfully emerging.

Why are they ignored by the international community and their Governments which must - and should - know what is going on in the southern part of Africa. May I regretfully suggest that it is politically expedient not to recognize facts and to ignore reality. Why undermine their existence and cause further misery? For what purpose? For what evil end? And

(Mr. Gqoso)

unfortunately that is the only conclusion we can come to, that it is an evil concept of power grabbing and greed.

The leadership of these independent States cannot be wished away. It is the truth that the ANC want these leaders who do not support them to be eliminated - and attempts have been made to do so. That is the fact.

The old apartheid is a corpse to be buried. But a bigger and more sinister form of apartheid is now emerging. It is perpetrated by the African National Congress and their alliance. It is with a viciousness beyond description.

The people of my country have a problem with substituting black racism for white racism - black apartheid for white apartheid. The myth of black-white politics is over. What matters now to my people is the question of shared values and standards, not the question of colour or separation.

To be shot dead is merciful compared with the slow mental and physical torture from a necklace. Fear haunts the people in my part of the world today, especially in the townships where amenities are very sparse, fear drives many people to murder because they have to avenge or protect themselves. That is the reality of South Africa and my country today.

Violence is not an accident. It is orchestrated in a number of ways by those who will not acknowledge the realities of change.

When the policemen get in to stop this violence, they are damned and chased away with propaganda and world-wide media coverage, and these people are turned out of their townships. Immediately they are out of the townships violence starts and the world again is told that the South African Government, or the Ciskei Government, or any other of these State Governments, refuse to stop, or do not want to stop, violence. That is a fact.

(Mr. Gqozo)

The ANC wishes to impose outdated and unsuccessful foreign ideologies on peaceful religious and traditional people. Is this democracy? Is this not a violation of peoples' human rights? They promote mass violence, which they think will bring about change. This change is already in process. The fact of the matter is that their activities impact negatively on the process of change. It promotes resentment, intimidation and resistance to authority.

Disagree or oppose the ANC in any way and you become a target for violence. However, there is growing opposition, reaction and response to all this. Violence is met with violence, because the most peaceful man will protect his loved ones and his property with everything that he has.

The vicious circle of events continues day and night. The ANC does not want negotiations. To continue to negotiate would mean that the ANC would have to share power, and all that goes with it, with other parties and organizations. The ANC wants it all: absolute power. There have been world wars to prevent just this. Why must South Africa be an exception?

The ANC claims that it represents the majority of South Africans. It is a blatant lie. In numbers their representation is but a fraction of the total population of black, white, Indian, coloured and other Asiatic races within the borders of South Africa.

It is the very refusal to acknowledge that there have been radical and far-reaching changes in South Africa - and more changes are still in the process - that is a major cause for the continuing violence and unrest. And the world looks on, and for inexplicable reasons, backs a minority party, nay, an organization which has yet to declare itself a political party, for so-called majority rule. They just do not represent the majority of the people of South Africa, no matter how many times they say so.

(Mr. Gqozo)

We are nations of varying cultures and languages in a country which has in the main been wrongfully villified when superhuman efforts are being made to rectify the past. Of course, apartheid has wrecked all our lives. But we have got to give it a chance to change. We have got to trust the whites in South Africa to change. Yet the prejudices increase and are maintained against South Africa, even by one of its minority players - as far as representation is concerned - the ANC.

Surely by now it is obvious what their game is and what the ANC want to achieve through violence within South Africa and propaganda on a world-wide scale.

More and more we are led to believe that it is not what South Africa is or was, or what South Africa has done or is doing, but what South Africa has and they - the States and Governments who support the ANC claims - want it and want to control it unfettered. What else can we believe when we see just how much the ANC is revered out of all proportion to their representation in South Africa, where millions, yes, multi-millions, oppose them but dare not say so because of reprisals and intimidation; and the wherewithal to implement reprisals and intimidation has been supplied by the people and Governments outside of South Africa.

To achieve their objectives the ANC and its allies have vowed publicly to render South Africa and Ciskei and Bophuthatswana ungovernable. Is this democratic? The world insists on democratic process towards a new South Africa, and yet there are those in responsible positions who continue to support the ANC which implements undemocratic ways to achieve their goals. Again, we ask why?

(Mr. Ggoqo)

We are not stooges of the South African Government or any other Government or organization for that matter. We demand a hearing, because our people are suffering and have suffered for too long, because we are all bona fide South Africans, born and bred there. And it will get worse unless the ANC's activities can be stopped and it is brought to negotiations.

By no stretch of the imagination could the ANC achieve their objectives of being the Government through negotiations and democratic processes without intimidation. The ANC still maintains outdated ideologies. They support, and are supported by, terrorist groups and organizations in many parts of the world. They have openly admitted this on a number of occasions. The ANC believes in eliminating its political rivals, especially leaders.

I speak with the benefit of sad experience because I have been the victim of these tactics. The ANC is intolerant of opposition. They have stated that the very existence of a political movement in my area - which espouses a contrary view - is provocation in itself and should be destroyed. This statement has been followed by no less than 148 violent attacks. People were killed, harmed, maimed and injured; their property was destroyed by petrol bombs, arson and confiscation; their dignity was offended by harassment and insults.

In my country youths are being recruited by the ANC so that they can be trained abroad and returned to usurp the Government and defy existing authority. The ANC continues to stockpile weapons in various parts of South Africa. Why? Surely the answer is obvious now. They want power through the barrel of a gun. And to say that they are fighting apartheid is no longer relevant. They are fighting anybody that opposes them.

(Mr. Ggozo)

The truth is that the South African security forces are well trained and well equipped to deal with any crime, subversion, or terrorism, as well as any civil disobedience or uprising. That is why they incurred the wrath of the ANC. For this reason a peace-keeping force will not be a success. It would inevitably have to serve ANC interests. In any case, the ANC would not accept a peace-keeping force, or any other force - or any other organization, for that matter - in South Africa unless it complied with ANC's demands. The revolutionary forces in South Africa are making it difficult in practice, and will make it difficult for any professional force to execute its tasks efficiently and effectively because of their attitude and intimidation activities. These make it difficult for the masses to cooperate freely with the security or law enforcement agencies in combating violence.

The ANC armed units have masqueraded as security forces on a number of occasions and committed crimes of despicable violence so as to implicate the forces of law and order. And what has been disappointing and sad is that much of the world media has propagated this to make the world believe that South African security forces are, in fact, involved in these dastardly acts. Of course, some have been found to be involved, but not all, as it is claimed.

Let me state that not a single person in my country has lost his life or property as a result of South African security forces or police action - and many people have died in my country. All deaths, injuries and damage to property have been caused by the ANC and their followers.

CODESA did not fail. It was sabotaged by the ANC under the direction of the South African Communist Party.

It should have been the opportunity for all of us to solve our differences with dignity and purpose. It has been reduced to a futile

(Mr. Ggozo)

exercise by the militant and uncompromising people who refused to negotiate when they realized they could not prescribe to CODESA. That is a fact.

The ANC/SACP strategies have now resulted in 40 per cent of the population - that is, 6 million people - being unemployed; 50,000 jobs lost in the first six months of this year from only four employment sectors; armed robberies increased by over 20 per cent in four months and hijackings have increased by more than 54 per cent in the first four months of this year.

The ANC has openly declared its opposition to investment in South Africa by foreign Powers and companies. The ANC does not want a prosperous South Africa in which they would quickly lose the support of the people and find it hard to stir the people to violent action. The ANC is now calling for mass action, which means confrontation with the forces of law and order. The ANC would welcome such clashes with deaths and injuries, which would once again occupy the front pages of world newspapers and the commentaries on radio and television.

I assure members it is the wish of all South Africans that whenever an opinion is required all leaders should be consulted, including the leaders of independent and self-governing states in South Africa who have been branded for propaganda purposes as irrelevant and stooges of the South African Government.

What is important in South Africa is that people must now stop clinging to empty slogans and ideologies; address the realities of South Africa - a heterogenous society which needs to be approached on those lines; achieve a federation, or federal system of Government, to accommodate all minorities and have all checks and balances; develop a strong economy based on free-market principles instead of socialism and talks of nationalization; and realize that

(Mr. Gqozo)

there is an urgent need for all leaders to have respect for each other, tolerance for each other's viewpoint, and an acceptance that not one party can ever hope to dominate all the others. These are the realities of my country.

I pray that all leaders here today will call upon the wisdom of Almighty God to guide them in their decisions. May God save South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Brigadier Gqozo for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. J. N. Reddy, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. REDDY: At the outset, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks for the honour and privilege, as the leader of Solidarity Party of South Africa, to address this body on the question of South Africa. We also wish to record our appreciation to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for initiating this meeting and the United Nations Security Council for acceding to the request. The question of South Africa was brought to this international body by India in 1946 and has since occupied a prominent role in the debates. It is appropriate that, as a body established to maintain peace and a democratic order, the United Nations Security Council is actively engaged in promoting its goals and objectives.

The South African question is not beyond resolution, given the will of all political parties to seek the new order through the process of peace and negotiation. My party is firmly committed to seek change through peace if the benefits of change are to be lasting in this country. Violence, as we have seen, will only plunge the country into chaos and, in the words of the representative of Japan "a deeper crisis benefits no one" (3095th meeting, p. 97). Violence serves no useful political end and, as violence acted on in

(Mr. Reddy)

desperation becomes endemic, there are, in fact, no winners. Violence is an assault on the dignity of the individual.

It is precisely for this reason that my party is a participant in a convention for a democratic South Africa (CODESA), a signatory to the National Peace Accord, and the Declaration of Intent. There is already agreement, inter alia, that South Africa will be a democratic, non-racial, non-sexist, sovereign State; the constitution will be the supreme law; all will enjoy universally accepted human rights; there will be a separation of powers between the legislative, executive and the judiciary and appropriate checks and balances; there will be a multi-party democracy and regular elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage on a common voters' roll; an electoral system based on proportional representation; and that a constitution should provide for effective participation of minority political parties consistent with democracy. Participants are also mindful of the awesome responsibility that rests upon us at this moment in the history of the country. Although parties declared themselves to be bound by the agreements, unfortunately, we have witnessed a stalemate in the process of negotiation.

The Boipatong massacre was a needless and unwarranted event, tragically occurring after the breakdown of the CODESA proceedings, and only reinforces my belief and commitment that there is only one way to a democratic order in South Africa, namely, through negotiation. To stray from this narrow, difficult and arduous track leads to an escalation of violence, uncertainty, frustration and anger and tragic consequences, as we have already witnessed. I want to record my Party's deepest condolences once again to the families of Boipatong and pray that we never again have occasion to witness such human tragedy.

(Mr. Reddy)

Let us also put violence in South Africa in the proper perspective. The policy of racial discrimination, enshrined in the 1910 Constitution and culminating in the policy of legalized apartheid for nearly the past 50 years, has contributed to structural violence. The Sharpeville, Soweto and Boipatong incidents are a physical manifestation of that violence. We are merely reaping the negative effects of apartheid. South Africa is a polarized society, and the policy of apartheid has sown distrust, fear and frustration. There are diverse political proposals by the various parties - all are committed to democracy; yet it would be simplistic and naive to believe that the negotiation process will not be without its difficulties. There is no easy walk to freedom and democracy, more so in a society which has little exposure to a democratic culture and values. A new nation born out of the apartheid system is not without trauma and trepidation.

(Mr. Reddy)

Violence undermines the fundamental process of democracy. One cannot negotiate in an atmosphere of violence. Hence, the National Peace Accord was set to level the political playing field to create a climate that is conducive to peaceful constitutional change. Negotiation is a fragile process. Violence undermines what progress has been achieved. Violence leads to frustration and bloodshed and tends to reinforce itself as a vicious cycle.

The apartheid system, and the violence that stems from it, has eroded our economy. The economy is being held to ransom. The purpose of negotiation was precisely to promote economic growth and human development and to ensure equal opportunities and social justice for all. There is a rising expectation in the community to enjoy immediately the benefits of change. However, sanctions and violence have contributed to depressing the economy and consequently the quality of life, leading to frustration born out of unfulfilled expectations. Desperate actions arising out of frustration only tend further to fuel violence.

I do not mwish to elaborate on the causes of violence. Suffice it to say that a complex set of factors related to economiuc, political, eduational and housing questions are interwoven. On the other hand, there are also numerous role-players who have also contributed, directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, consciously or unconsciously, to a lesser or greater extent, to the issue of violence.

We must desist from the practice of apportioning culpability, as this only entrenches frustration and further divides our society. There are shortcomings on all sides.

While the responsibility for ending the violence is a collective one, the greater share of that responsibility must rest with the South African Government, which must now pursue its role vigorously and with greater

(Mr. Reddy)

determination. The South African Government has a legal responsibility, while political parties and the people have a moral responsibility to end violence. Our common commitment must be to take the process collectively towards a solution and acknowledge the fact that compromise is necessary in any new democratic order. A compromise solution is not the ideal solution, but it is the best we can achieve under the circumstances.

My party is committed to the establishment of a democratic Government. However, there are different perceptions of democracy among the various political parties, and one has to reconcile the various concepts in order to achieve consensus. South Africa is an emerging democracy; mature democracies have gone through the learning curve. Preserving the rules of the game is the highest imperative of any democracy, even in times of political and economic crisis. The democratic order proved to be more difficult to build than the prophets and revolutionaries of the French Revolution dreamed. Considering the tensions we are currently witnessing in many parts of the world on the issue of minorities, this question must be addressed constructively and in depth.

My party, Solidarity, wishes to make the following recommendations: Firstly, we believe that the way forward is through negotiation, as it is the only viable and legitimate process to effect a new constitution and establish a democratic order. Dialogue must be an ongoing and continuous process, and the momentum of negotiation must be maintained. Let me also emphasize that negotiation can only take place in a climate of peace and stability. All parties, in and out of CODESA, must refrain from any action or statement that would be a catalyst for violence. Peace in South Africa can only be established by the players and the people themselves, who must create

(Mr. Reddy)

conditions conducive to negotiation. The solution must be found by its own people within the country.

Secondly, we welcome the involvement of the United Nation Security Council in contributing to conditions that would encourage negotiations. We support the proposal to send a special representative of the Secretary-General to South Africa to facilitate the resumption of the CODESA process and negotiations. This must be a good-will exercise in keeping with a mission of the United Nations. We request the establishment of a United Nations consitution-monitoring committee to monitor and evaluate the proceedings and outcome once negotiations are resumed.

Thirdly, we urge all current CODESA participants to recommence negotiation and to re-commit themselves to the National Peace Accord and the Declaration of Intent in order to stem violence, and further urge all other political parties not presently involved to participate in the process if they subscribe to a democratic order.

Fourthly, we believe that urgent attention should be given to economic reconstruction simultaneous with political changes, as inheriting an economic wasteland would be a Pyrrhic victory. Political democracy and Economic liberalism are the twin pillars of progress. They go hand in hand.

The acid test of democracy is the threshold of tolerance of differences: the lower the level, the greater the instability. Challenges must be turned into accomplishments and not frustrations. All parties must transcend parochialism and respond to the greater challenge of nation-building. To fail to act wisely now will ensure only having to act desperately later.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Reddy for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Joosab, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. JOOSAB: This is a momentous day for the National People's Party of South Africa, and the decision of the Security Council to invite all the participants of CODESA speaks volumes of the very impartial and objective manner in which the Security Council has handled the very sensitive and delicate situation that exists in our beloved country today. The efforts of many - in South Africa and also in the international community - will decide whether South Africa will become another Lebanon or Bosnia. The violence in the aforementioned arenas are grim reminders that every effort must be made, with the international community playing a role, to chart a course for the peaceful resolution of our country's problems and to initiate steps for the speedy implementation of a non-racial democratic government.

On this significant day I pause to remember a great speech delivered at this Assembly in 1948 by a great man of peace, Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, who as the first Prime Minister of free India stated that

> "The world consists of a variety of nations differing in their ideas and their economic development. We must recognise these differences and not seek to try to coerce or compel anyone to function according to a particular way. Coercion sows the seeds for confrontation and violence."

We are not here today to condemn anyone. If there is strict adherence to the culture of tolerance, to allow individuals and organizations to choose their own directions, and if the leaders of every force in South Africa

(Mr. Joosab)

dedicate themselves to the cessation of violence at a grass-root level, then South Africa will be a country that will be the pride of the world.

The diversity of South African society is in many respects comparable to those of India and Yugoslavia. Learning from bitter experience in these countries, we all must dedicate ourselves to ensuring that inter-group or inter-factional conflicts are totally eradicated.

There have been accusations and counter-accusations. Inflammatory speeches have been made. Fingers cannot be pointed in one direction only. Instead of respect for each other, mistrust is growing and getting stronger each day.

I wish to state very clearly here today that there is no alternative to peace and negotiations. While we believe that South Africans are capable of finding each other, there is a genuine need for the international community to play a role.

(Mr. Joosab)

The United Nations has a role in providing objectivity. We are of the view that the level of the role of the United Nations or any other organization should be a negotiated one between the participants of CODESA.

We suggest that the Security Council resolve that it will play a role in the resumption of negotiations. With such an initiative, negotiations should be expedited in our country. We have great faith in South Africa and its future.

The United Nations should also play a role in ensuring that no one is coerced into accepting a particular constitutional model for South Africa. Like India, South Africa is a country of strong regional diversities. This should be taken into account, because the foundations must be strong. It must furthermore be internationally recognized that certain details will take time to resolve; however, the installation of an interim government in terms of a sound constitution cannot be delayed. It will instil confidence and play a role in reducing the violence.

My party commends the Security Council's decision that the United Nations will, by agreement with all CODESA participants, make its presence felt in South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Joosab for his brevity.

The next speaker is Mr. Kenneth Andrew, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ANDREW: I welcome this opportunity on behalf of the Democratic Party of South Africa to participate in the Council's deliberations. For more than 30 years, the Democratic Party and its predecessors have opposed apartheid. We are guided by our belief in equal rights and freedom for all

(Mr. Andrew)

South Africans, in human dignity and in the rule of law. Our vision for South Africa is based on a constitution produced through negotiation by the authentic leaders of all South Africa's peoples, and in terms of which a parliament for an undivided South Africa would be elected on the basis on one person, one vote.

The establishment of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa represented a significant and historic opportunity for South Africa. The Democratic Party (DP) was an active participant in setting up CODESA, it provided the first chairperson of its Management Committee, and it has played a full role in its proceedings.

CODESA operated with great success for the first five months of this year. Enormous strides were made towards the resolution of problems which hitherto had seemed intractable. During the second plenary session of CODESA, held on 15 and 16 May 1992, the negotiations stalled and have subsequently broken down. The DP deeply regrets this occurrence. We are doing everything in our power to persuade those whose positions have contributed to this breakdown to recognize the urgent need to resume negotiations, they being the only acceptable and legitimate process for moving our country forward towards a durable democracy.

CODESA remains frustrated not only by the breakdown of the negotiations themselves, but also by the violence characterizing our society at present. It is clear that both problems need to be addressed simultaneously.

The causes of the violence in South Africa have been analysed in the interim reports of the Goldstone Commission. Its second interim report states that "the causes of the violence are many and complicated", and include the economic, social and political imbalances resulting from a history of racial

(Mr. Andrew)

discrimination and specifically from apartheid; the perceived partiality - and therefore unpopularity - of the police and army in South Africa; the climate of political intolerance, particularly in black communities; and the rise of criminal tendencies in the face of inadequate policing.

On the issue of political violence, the Commission concluded that:

"Both the African National Congress (ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) members and supporters have been guilty of many incidents that have resulted in the deaths of, and injuries to, large numbers of people."

The Commission also drew attention to:

"a history over some years of State complicity in undercover activities, which include criminal conduct".

Generally, the Commission concluded:

"It is little wonder, therefore, that the situation of political violence and intimidation in South Africa is so widespread and its causes so many and so complex."

Similar findings were reported by an "Independent Survey of the Violence in South Africa" by the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ). It, too, concluded that the causes of the violence were "many and varied", and included large-scale unemployment; massive urbanization, with associated squalor; the lack of trust in the forces of law and order; the breakdown in the authority of traditional leaders; the collapse of education for blacks; political rivalry; and gang warfare. The ICJ reported that:

"While apartheid and the ideology of separate development are the root causes of the trouble, violent political rivalry exacerbated by random killings have now become the dominant factor in people's lives".

(Mr. Andrew)

It is the Democratic Party's considered view that these two reports are, generally, correct in both their analyses and conclusions. South Africa would be far better served if political parties paid careful attention to the contents of the aforementioned reports, rather than attempting to use, cynically and short-sightedly, the current violence as an exercise in political point-scoring and mobilization. We also believe that little purpose is served in apportioning blame among the political contestants for the current violence, but that all parties' energies and actions should be directed at eliminating this scourge from our society.

More than anything else, the ongoing impasse in South Africa creates a new legacy of bitterness, a new group of martyrs, a fresh set of seemingly intractable problems. It delays not only the resumption of negotiations but also the recovery and growth of the South African economy, so necessary to create the wealth for the upliftment of those people, whose dignity has been demeaned and life-chances stunted by the policy of apartheid.

Ordinary South Africans want a new constitution. They yearn for a peaceful resolution to the violence. They want to build a new non-racial society and a prosperous economy.

The crux issue is that there is no acceptable alternative to multi-party negotiations. Ironically, the issues which have led to the breakdown of talks can themselves be resolved only through re-engagement in the very process now in suspense.

We believe that the international community could play a constructive role in helping to resolve the current crisis in South Africa. While we would welcome any bona fide efforts of assistance, in the final analysis a new

(Mr. Andrew)

constitution, to be durable and binding, will have to be the product of negotiation and agreement among South Africans themselves.

One of the most critical problems facing South Africa at present is the level of mistrust in the security forces and their ability to deal effectively with political violence.

The major parties and institutions in South Africa have ignored, or been tardy in implementing, recommendations made by the Goldstone Commission and/or have not been fully cooperative with the structures established by the National Peace Accord.

In our view, restoring trust and confidence in the institutions responsible for peace requires the promotion and strengthening of the institutions set up in terms of the National Peace Accord.

A useful element in this regard could be the appointment of a panel of international figures who can command the respect and trust of all signatories to the National Peace Accord, who could then promote the Accord both internally and internationally.

(Mr. Andrew)

It should be stressed that, to be effective, any action to promote peace in South Africa contemplated by the international community must be endorsed by all the signatories of the National Peace Accord.

One urgent task is to restore peace. The other is to resume constitutional negotiations and implement agreements already arrived at by CODESA. To facilitate this process, there may well be a role for a respected and impartial person to undertake a mission to South Africa to facilitate the resumption of negotiations.

In addition, the international community could play a role in maintaining the momentum of the negotiation and transition processes. In this regard, an independent person or agency could perform a mediating function, ensuring that steady progress is achieved in reaching and implementing decisions made by South African parties. The chief role of such a person or agency would be to prevent a breakdown in negotiations as a result of non-adherence to agreements and/or recommendations and the consequent cycle of accusations and counter-accusations of bad faith.

While it is true that in some cases, non-adherence to agreements results from legitimate and practical problems, in many others it derives from a desire by particular organizations to create breathing space for themselves or to seize a political advantage. If progress towards the resolution of the constitutional impasse is to be made, binding agreements reached as a result of bilateral or multilateral negotiations must be steadily and consistently carried through. The people of South Africa should be informed by a trusted person or agency where fault for non-compliance lies.

Any role by the international community should not absolve political parties inside South Africa from their responsibility to resolve problems,

(Mr. Andrew)

particularly those resulting from violence and the breakdown of negotiations. At best, the international community can help the process. It cannot impose a constitution on South Africa. Accordingly, any steps it takes should be approved by as wide a cross-section of South African political organizations as possible.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Norway. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. HUSLID (Norway): I am grateful for this opportunity to state my Government's view on the critical situation in South Africa. Given the lateness of the hour, I shall try to do so as briefly as possible.

Norway condemns the eruptions of violence that have taken place in South Africa. We are deeply concerned that the tragic cycle of violence will have dire consequences for the whole negotiating process and the democratization of South Africa. The recent massacre in Boipatong has tragically reminded us of those dangers.

It is against this background that Norway calls on all parties to cease the violence immediately. Restraint must be shown in order to facilitate the resumption of the talks that were recently suspended. In particular, Norway calls on the South African Government to take all necessary measures immediately to protect the lives and property of all South Africans. The prospects for the whole country will indeed be gloomy if the fighting does not stop and the talks are not resumed soon.

We have noted the proposals made during these meetings and the prior consultations, including the draft resolution which is before the Council. Norway favors direct involvement of the United Nations in the current situation. This could be in the form of an international mechanism agreeable

(Mr. Huslid, Norway)

to all parties, and should result from close consultations based on fact-finding by the Secretary-General and his proposed special representative. As has been indicated by Foreign Minister Stoltenberg, Norway is ready to participate in and contribute actively to any such mechanism.

The international community clearly has a responsibility in building the peace and preventing hostilities. Against the background of the Secretary-General's recent report "An Agenda for Peace", Norway firmly believes that the situation in South Africa now requires a concerted international initiative. Every effort must be made to support the process towards the transformation of South Africa into a united, democratic and non-racial society. Indeed, the unique opportunity which is now before us must not and cannot be lost.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): Allow me, Sir, to present our warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. Brazil, which has long-standing ties of friendship and brotherhood with Cape Verde, is pleased to see you presiding over the deliberations of the Council at this important moment. There is no doubt that your well-known diplomatic skills are a valuable asset for the Council.

Brazil welcomes the fact that the Security Council is utilizing its renewed authority to examine, as in the past, the situation resulting from the recent incidents of civil violence in South Africa. We commend the initiative

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

taken by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the African Group in New York in requesting emergency meetings of the Council to discuss and take action on this pressing issue.

The Brazilian Government believes it is very fortunate that the Security Council is able to profit in these circumstances from the participation of Mr. Nelson Mandela in the discussion.

The well-known links between the need for totally eradicating apartheid and the preservation of international security fully warrant the participation of this Council in measures to overcome the problem of civil conflicts in South Africa and to accelerate the complete dismantling of the structures of apartheid. In fact, the complexity of the problem has long engaged the collective efforts of all relevant organs of the United Nations.

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this subject - particularly the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa and resolution 46/79 A - continue to provide important, indeed indispensable, guidance for action by the international community.

Violence is ugly in itself, and invariably loathsome. Violence leads to more violence, thus breeding a cycle of escalating horrors. It is the duty of honest men to denounce it and to stop it without delay.

The various incidents of attacks against individuals and property in South Africa over the last few months, including the outrageous Boipatong massacre on 17 June, have generated serious and well-founded concern in the international community. The Government and the people of Brazil were profoundly shocked by those actions, whose inhumane quality offends the conscience and pierces the heart. To the victims of these unconscionable acts, and to their families and friends, goes our warmest sympathy.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

The killings and wanton violence in black townships are not only unacceptable crimes; they also threaten the process of negotiation, which is aimed at putting an end to the most fundamental form of violence. Indeed, the ultimate source of violence is the evil system of apartheid.

Brazil has consistently supported the efforts of the South African people to eliminate racism and racial discrimination. We have consistently supported measures by the United Nations to assist those efforts and to accelerate the ending of apartheid.

We have been encouraged by the important steps taken by the South African authorities to repeal the major legislative pillars of apartheid and to ensure greater political freedom. An extremely promising process of transition through dialogue and negotiation has been set in motion.

We are now disturbed by the thought that a persistent failure to contain the waves of violence in South Africa could harm that process or make it move at a slower pace. There is no time to be lost in building a democratic, non-racial society in a united South Africa. Each day lost in that effort is a day lost for justice and for human rights. Each day lost in the dismantling of apartheid is a day lost in the strengthening of regional and international security. That violence has to be stopped immediately.

For the dialogue between the various parties in South Africa to move forward smoothly and quickly it is essential to ensure a favourable climate of social peace and mutual confidence. Guaranteeing that such conditions prevail is by no means an optional luxury, but an essential element of the efforts towards political and social change in South Africa.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

It is the duty of all Member States and organs of the United Nations to make whatever contribution is within their power to assist the efforts of those who sincerely wish to break the cycle of violence and achieve long-lasting civil peace. We owe it to ourselves, but most of all to the long-suffering people of that country, who deserve, as people everywhere do, a life lived in peace and dignity, an opportunity to prosper and to flourish as a free nation.

Peace in South Africa is long overdue. Brazil, a South Atlantic State like South Africa, hopes that nothing will hinder that people on the road to freedom and justice. We strongly support continued attention and action by the United Nations to that end.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Portugal. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Miss MENDES (Portugal): On behalf of the delegation of Portugal and on my own behalf, I would like to tell you, Sir, how pleased we are to see you presiding over the Security Council this month, especially representing an African country whose official language is Portuguese and with very close ties of friendship and cooperation with Portugal. We know you for your great qualities, which reflect the respect of Cape Verde for the Charter of the United Nations and international laws and norms. Your presidency also reflects your diplomatic and political qualities and great abilities. We are fully confident that you will lead the work of the Council with great success.

Let me also express our deep appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme, for the remarkable way in which he handled the work of the Security Council last month.

(Miss Mendes, Portugal)

The recent dramatic events of Boipatong have given a new dimension to the problem of violence in South Africa, which constitutes a serious concern to the Portuguese Government, both for the high cost in human life and in suffering for the South African people and for the negative impact on the building of a new democratic and non-racial South Africa. The commitment with which Portugal has supported from the outset the transition process in South Africa, starting about two and half years ago with the release of Mr. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, is well known.

We believe that it is in the framework of CODESA that the principles and timetables must be agreed upon for setting up a provisional government and holding democratic elections leading to the achievement of the final objective: the creation of a united, non-racial and democratic society based on the application of the principle of "one man, one vote".

The international community must consider as a priority the appeal to the South African Government, to the African National Congress (ANC) and to all the other forces representing South African society to resume talks in the framework of CODESA, so that goals may be established that are accepted by all for the process of political transition in South Africa. The resumption of negotiations will in itself be an important factor of internal stabilization that will certainly contribute to the economic development of South Africa in particular, and economic development in southern Africa in general, with resulting benefits to their peoples.

At the same time, efforts must be redoubled so that major steps may be made for effective containment of the violence. The National Peace Accord, signed in September 1991, is an important instrument that, unfortunately, has not produced the desired effects. It will be important to strengthen the

(Miss Mendes, Portugal)

intermediate peace structures created by this agreement, as well as to continue to support the activities of independent entities, such as the Goldstone Commission.

Portugal, although aware that the maintenance of public order is, in the first place, the responsibility of the Government of South Africa, considers that the resolution of this problem will depend on the commitment of all the representatives of the political forces and will have to take into account the principle of acceptance and participation of all the different South African parties involved.

The organization of good-offices missions, the support of cooperative efforts for the restructuring of the police forces and participation in programmes of social impact that will alleviate some of the social needs associated with the problem of violence - such as the improvement of living conditions in temporary housing - may be measures to be considered.

We strongly support the use by the Secretary-General of his good offices, and we believe that the dispatch to South Africa of a special representative would be an important step in the right direction.

My country, as a member of the European Community, actively supports various Community initiatives that were pointed out yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom, the country that now holds the presidency. We should like to underscore the following initiatives in particular, because they were taken during the first half of 1992, when Portugal held the presidency of the European Community: first, preparation of and upcoming visit of the Troika of the European Community to South Africa, in which the question of violence will be discussed; secondly, the visit of

(Miss Mendes, Portugal)

a delegation of the European Community, headed by a member of the Portguese Government, for the second plenary session of CODESA; thirdly, the statement on violence, released on 23 June, following the incidents in Boipatong; fourthly, conclusions on South Africa approved at the Lisbon European Council of Ministers on 27 June; and, fifthly, major reinforcement of the "Special Apartheid Victims Programme".

The building of a democratic, non-racial regime in South Africa that will allow the creation of the conditions for a life of stability and economic development for all South African citizens will also depend on the pragmatism and readiness of the international community to resolve this dramatic problem. Portugal would like to state on this occasion its readiness to participate in this common effort.

I thank the Council very much for allowing me to take part in this debate.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Portugal for her kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Germany. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GRAF ZU RANTZAU (Germany): It is an honour for me to take the floor today in the Security Council under your wise and efficient chairmanship, Sir. As your distinguished predecessor did, you will, I am confident, in masterly fashion live up to the task of leading the Council's work to a successful conclusion.

This debate takes place at a moment of great challenge and of historic opportunity, not only for the people of South Africa, but for the whole region of southern Africa.

(Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau, Germany)

Together we have achieved a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. Serious efforts are being made to implement a peace agreement in Angola and to find a political solution through negotiations in Mozambique. Now the whole international community is united in its support for fundamental change in South Africa by peaceful means.

(Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau, Germany)

My Government welcomes the initiative of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to call for this meeting, the importance of which is highlighted by the presence of a large number of Foreign Ministers, of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, and of Mr. Nelson Mandela.

Over the last few years, a good number of outdated ideologies have been thrown overboard - irrevocably, we hope. This development strongly encourages all those who - within South Africa and here at the United Nations - fight for the immediate abolition of the inhuman system of apartheid and subsequently for the establishment of a new democratic order by way of a systematic negotiating process.

Germany has welcomed the increasing signs that South Africa has reached the threshold of a new era. In this spirit my Government supported the "Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa" of December 1989. As reflected in the following consensus documents of the United Nations that Declaration constituted a turning point which, indeed, brought the dismantling of apartheid and its replacement by a democratic, united, non-racial society into prospect.

Today my Government commends the important steps undertaken by President de Klerk and his Government on the one hand, and by the African National Congress, under the leadership of Nelson Mandela as well as by other South Africans committed to democracy on the other hand, that opened the way into the CODESA negotiating process. Together with the overwhelming majority of South African citizens who aim at a democratic South Africa through peaceful change, where all citizens without discrimination can live together

(Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau, Germany)

and work for a better common future, we insist that this historic chance must not be lost. CODESA must reconvene without delay.

The encouraging beginning of the CODESA negotiations and its broad support among the people of South Africa gave rise to the expectation that the process leading towards the dismatlement of apartheid is irreversible. Jointly with our European partners, we honoured this expectation.

However, recent events in South Africa provoke the question whether opponents to this process believe that they might halt or reverse the course of history by fomenting violence, seeding hatred, delaying essential reforms, or by deviating from the path of compromise.

We believe the process to abolish apartheid cannot and will not be halted. All the more do we deplore the senseless sacrifices now weighing heavily on the process of reconciliation, and we mourn those who died.

We appeal to all parties to the conflict to stop violence. We urge steps towards a more effective control of police forces and towards the prevention of further unlawful use of force, notably by implementing the recommendations made by the Goldstone Commission. In this context, we refer to the Declaration of the Lisbon Summit meeting of the European Community, as well as to the Final Declaration of the Munich Summit of the G7, and we reiterate our preparedness to contribute, jointly with our European partners, to the limitation of violence and the continuation of the negotiating process.

We expect the South African security authorities to respect the political rights of everybody and to adhere strictly to the principle of adequacy of means. We also expect the organizers of mass actions to obey the principle of non-violence - a principle that some decades ago had taken its origin in South Africa, subsequently to conquer public opinion around the world.

(Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau, Germany)

We deplore the interruption of the process of negotiations and appeal to all parties to be aware of the historic importance of the CODESA process, and therefore to resume negotiations without delay and with a view of concluding them as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Germany for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Botswana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Mr. President, you are my friend and you have appealed for brevity. Therefore, I hope you will forgive me if I do not congratulate you, so I will go straight into my statement.

Mr. President, I think you and the Security Council must now realize how important it was for this meeting to be convened. You have given South African leaders the opportunity to come and express themselves, vent their frustrations, say what they want to do with their country and what they do not want to do with their country - whether they are going to mess it up or not mess it up. This information is very valuable for the Security Council, because those of us who come from southern Africa believe it important that the same concern that the Council has shown for crises elsewhere be shown for the crises in Africa - the crisis in southern Africa being one of them, not forgetting the crisis in Somalia and the crisis in Liberia. Indeed, this is an important meeting, and I think we should take off our hats to the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), who insisted that it be held. We hope that this meeting will end with something that will contribute towards finding a solution to the problem that we face in South Africa.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

I say this because there has been some apprehension, at least at the outset in certain quarters, about our decision to come to the Security Council to debate the situation in South Africa. We have heard it argued that a meeting of the Council would serve no useful purpose, that it would only compound an already confused and bloody situation. Instead of our coming to the Security Council to fan the flames of violence, it was suggested that we should devote our energies to pressuring the parties in the CODESA process to return to the conference table to get on with the negotiations.

While these are very fine arguments they are a bit disingenuous. Why should the unremitting violence now ravaging urban and peri-urban South Africa not be debated in this very Security Council which has devoted - as I said a while ago - months of concentrated consultations and debates, and understandably so, to the violence in the Balkans and elsewhere? It has already been demonstrated that we have not called for this meeting on South Africa - at least those of us from Africa - with the intention either to seek confrontation or to pass a death sentence on CODESA, or to take sides in the troubled deliberations at CODESA. Our vested interest is solely - and I must repeat, solely - to seek explanations, not only about about the Boipatong massacre but about violence generally in South Africa today, the violence that may yet kill the CODESA process if allowed to persist unchecked.

The commitment of the frontline States, the countries of southern Africa generally and of the continent at large to the negotiation process in the CODESA framework is unmistakable - or in any framework that the people of South Africa might choose if they want to abandon CODESA - and God forbid that they should.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

We want CODESA to produce the new South Africa we have all sought for so long. We have never wavered in our constant appeal to the parties in the negotiations to show fortitude and patience in their collective endeavours to craft a new constitutional dispensation for their strife-torn country.

But the CODESA process needs peace and tranquillity if the negotiations are not only to flourish but also to succeed. There is no gainsaying the fact that in the present environment in South Africa, with its endless chain of massacres, CODESA has become an endangered process. Otherwise we would not be here to debate how the Security Council can assist in the rejuvenation of the process. Violence is not and cannot be a facilitator of the negotiation process. It is an inhibitor.

Now what is the teleology of the violence we are talking about? To those of us who do not live in South Africa, there is clearly something terribly sinister about the character of the violence. Many of those who have taken the floor before me have noted the character of the violence - its viciousness, mindlessness, randomness and senselessness, compounded by the thickening mystery of the Government's inability to control it. Why, with a police force that is 110,000 strong, the South African Government is unable to control the violence, isolated as it certainly is to a few pockets of strife in urban South Africa and some pockets of strife in rural South Africa? Why is it that the Government is unable to control the violence? This remains a mystery to us. And if it is a mystery to those of us who come from southern Africa, I do not know what it could be to those who enjoy the comfort of distance.

It is common knowledge that the notorious single hostels are dens of crime-infestation and anti-social pestilence engendered by the very squalid

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

and dehumanizing nature of these so-called barracks-like dwellings. What makes it so difficult for the police, for instance, to police these dwellings, search them and rid them of dangerous weapons or, if need be, surround them with security guards to ensure that they are not attacked by those who come from outside or from other hostels, or that the inmates of these hostels do not go out of the hostels armed to the teeth, either with so-called cultural weapons or with their modern weapons, to go and attack other hostels? Why is it that they just go out in broad daylight carrying these weapons and butcher people?

We are talking here - and please listen carefully - about one of the most vigilant and efficient police forces in the world, and I say that charitably: a see-all, know-all police machine which in its heyday saw and knew what was happening up to the Equator. Now, this very same police force, and for that matter, with an enhanced size - 110,000 policemen - cannot see or know what is happening inside South Africa, in trains, in hostels, at funerals and at political rallies. And some of these affairs are taking place during the day, without benefit of the cover of darkness. These same police arrive at scenes of public carnage hours late, long after the perpetrators have left, or arrive too early, because they have been warned, and then leave because they decide that there is no attack, not realizing that they are five hours early. And then they abandon the scene in advance and a few minutes later there is an attack.

It is because we in southern Africa have invested a great deal of hope in the CODESA process that we feel so strongly about what looks to us like a carefully calculated plot by some sinister forces in South Africa to sabotage CODESA, to return South Africa to its old, evil ways, to restore

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

"grand apartheid". For there is a very clear pattern to the violence, as we all know, as it has been pointed out here. The more progress CODESA makes the more vicious and brutal the escalation of the violence.

Yes, the stalled CODESA negotiations must of course be resuscitated. We hope they can be resuscitated so that new life, dynamism and purpose can be breathed into them, but with the proviso that a climate conducive to their success is created and enforced. As the Foreign Minister of Zimbabwe said yesterday, it is no use agitating; let us resuscitate CODESA. Let us resuscitate CODESA, but not in the kind of environment that exists in South Africa today because we are going to have another walkout. But I think one walkout is enough if we want the negotiations to succeed.

Therefore, even as we call on our brothers, on the leaders of South Africa to go back to the conference table to negotiate, of immediate importance to us is that we make sure that they can do so in an environment which will allow them to sit peacefully in that building in Johannesburg to negotiate a new dispensation for South Africa.

It must be repeated that the responsibility for creating such a climate conducive to the success of CODESA, rests with the Government of the day. Yes, all the leaders of South Africa have some responsibility to moderate the political activism of their followers, but they are not and cannot be vested with the primary responsibility to enforce law and order. They have a responsibility to help the Government of the day maintain law and order, but the maintenance of law and order rests on the shoulders of the Government; otherwise the Government is abnegating its responsibility.

It is our earnest hope that the Security Council will live up to its responsibilities by appointing the Special Representative as envisaged in the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

resolution it is about to adopt and giving the measure all the necessary teeth for this Special Representative to go to South Africa to do the job that we think must be done in order to assist the people of South Africa in their negotiations for the new South Africa, which I say we have all laboured so hard to achieve over the years.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Botswana for the kind words he addressed to me.

With the concurrence of members of the Council, I shall now suspend the meeting, and we shall reconvene at 3.30.

The meeting was suspended at 2.15 p.m. and resumed at 3.40 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Greece. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece): Permit me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. We are particularly pleased to see the presidency in the experienced hands of the Permanent Representative of Cape Verde, a country with which Greece has always maintained close and friendly relations.

I should also like to extend congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme, Permanent Representative of Belgium, on the skilful manner in which he conducted the Council's work during the month of June.

No one can dispute today that apartheid is an unacceptable political system that has to be eradicated in all its forms and practical consequences. Furthermore, the international community, as well as the main political leaders in South Africa, is committed to the creation of a united, non-racial and democratic South African society, through peaceful means and through negotiations involving all parties concerned.

The process of this transition, which began with the release of the President of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Mr. Nelson Mandela, has brought about spectacular positive results that gave us hope for an early negotiated conclusion. The realism of those involved in the negotiations has proved that there is ample ground for all South African elements to live and prosper in peace and national cooperation.

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

However, the ever-increasing violence in South Africa poses a serious threat to the negotiating process, and is undermining the results achieved thus far. Violence has already claimed many innocent South African lives, and has had a negative effect on the well-being of the population there. It must be stopped immediately. Otherwise, those opposing change will become the sole beneficiaries of the situation. To achieve this end, serious efforts are required at the domestic and international levels alike.

In a statement issued on 23 June 1992, the European Community and its member States expressed shock at the recent appalling incidents in South Africa, particularly in Boipatong, urged the South African Government to investigate those incidents rapidly and thoroughly so that those responsible might be punished, and called upon the leaders of all parties concerned to persevere with determination on the peaceful path to a non-racial democracy representative of all South Africans.

We believe that responsibility for checking the violence and guaranteeing the security and protection of the people lies primarily with the competent South African authorities. An equally important role is reserved for those who can influence developments in South Africa. The national peace accord of September 1991 provides a good example of the determination and good will of the signatory parties and constitutes an appropriate structure within which South Africans can work together to create the necessary climate of peace and confidence.

Since the South African Government stated its readiness to allow foreign observers to participate in the investigation of the most recent tragic massacre at Boipatong, room has been created for international assistance to the domestic efforts to curb the violence.

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

Greece welcomes the Security Council's invitation to the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to recommend measures that could effectively end the violence and assist in creating conditions for negotiations leading to a peaceful transition in South Africa. The Greek Government firmly believes that such negotiations must be conducted in good faith and in an atmosphere free of violence.

Greece shares the view that we must see these meetings of the Security Council as a chance to launch renewed efforts to resume negotiations in South Africa. We have noted that during this debate the main actors for change in South Africa have reaffirmed their willingness to keep the negotiating process alive. Also, the results of the recent referendum in South Africa proved beyond any doubt that the overwhelming majority of the population, irrespective of colour, race, religion or political belief, supports this process.

No effort should therefore be spared to preserve and consolidate the progress achieved thus far and use it as a basis for a firm, just and sound negotiated solution. We must help South African society keep the momentum and continue building upon what has been achieved so far.

Greece fully supports the draft resolution before the Security Council and states its readiness to work, either individually or collectively with its European Community partners, for its full and effective implementation.

Let us keep in mind that, now more than ever, the new reality of intensified subregional, regional and international cooperation in the political and economic fields points to an important role for a new, democratic, united and non-racial South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Greece for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Netherlands. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. VAN SCHAIK (Netherlands): My congratulations go to you, Sir, and your predecessor: to you on the important work you are currently undertaking, and to Ambassador Noterdaeme on the excellent work he performed last month.

The Netherlands, like its partners in the European Community, has throughout the years advocated the creation of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa, by peaceful means.

To that end, we have repeatedly called upon all parties in South Africa to stop the ongoing violence. Our position is that only broad-based negotiations can lead to a lasting settlement.

The Netherlands Government has welcomed the process of radical reform that was set in motion after President De Klerk took office in 1989. Thanks to the positive attitude of all parties concerned, negotiations in the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa were initiated in December 1991. This was a milestone on the way to a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa. In the wake of the positive outcome of the referendum of 17 March 1992, the early introduction of transitional arrangements was expected.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

The Netherlands is gravely concerned about the fact that in recent months negotiations have become increasingly difficult and that CODESA 2, held on 15 and 16 May, did not produce any concrete results.

The growing violence in South Africa is indeed very disturbing. We were shocked by the events at Boipatong on 17 June, which were followed by the suspension of negotiations.

The South African Government has a special responsibility for maintaining order. In the light of that the European Council issued a statement in Lisbon during the European Summit of 26 and 27 June pointing to

"the absolute need to ensure an effective control of the police and security forces".

The Netherlands Government once again calls for an end to the ongoing tragic and senseless bloodshed in South Africa.

It is vital that negotiations within the framework of CODESA be resumed as soon as possible. The Netherlands Government is convinced that only a dialogue between all the parties involved can lead to a new, free and democratic South Africa, and we call upon all concerned to resume the negotiations as soon as possible.

The Netherlands would welcome the appointment by the Secretary-General of a Special Representative in order to assist in creating the conditions for a resumption of the negotiating process and thus, we hope, contribute to an effective end of the violence. Meanwhile, we would like to express our appreciation for the good services so far rendered by the Secretary-General.

In the view of the Netherlands the international community can and should, with the assent of the parties involved, play a constructive role in restoring a climate of trust, which is essential for the process of

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

negotiations, a climate which, regrettably, does not prevail in South Africa at this moment. We therefore fully endorse the draft resolution as it has been prepared.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Netherlands for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Spain. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. YAÑEZ-BARNUEVO (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): It is with great pleasure that I echo the words of those who have congratulated you, Sir, on the way in which you have conducted the proceedings of the Council this month. Your political and legal ability and your diplomatic skill - to which I would now add your patience - ensure that these important meetings of the Security Council will achieve the results that we all hope for.

The Spanish Government, which from the outset welcomed the courage and political vision of President De Klerk and the President of the African National Congress, Nelson Mandela, and all other South African political leaders and officials who made possible the opening up of a hopeful process of change in South Africa, wishes to express here its conviction that we cannot and must not see frustrated the legitimate hopes that have been aroused.

Spain has followed with the greatest attention and interest the course of events in South Africa. We are greatly concerned by the recent escalation of violence, and in particular the massacre in Boipatong on 17 June and the violent incidents that followed.

The increasing violence in South Africa, with great loss of human life, has grave consequences not only for internal stability in that country but

(Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo, Spain)

also for the stability of the whole region. Therefore, it is a source of serious concern to the whole international community.

As a member of the European Community, Spain has already expressed its position with regard to the tragic events in Boipatong in the context of the declaration on South Africa adopted by the recent European Council meeting in Lisbon, referred to by, among others, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, which currently holds the presidency of the European Community.

We wish to repeat the horror felt in Spain over the violence unleashed in South Africa and to stress that the Spanish Government considers it essential that the facts be clarified and that responsibility be determined, always remembering that it is necessary to guarantee effective control of the police and security forces.

The fact that, despite the undoubted progress made, the apartheid regime has not yet been completely dismantled has extremely negative consequences for human rights for all South Africans, and in particular the majority. Specifically, it leads to outbreaks of violence such as those that have recently been seen in that country.

Therefore, Spain considers it of cardinal importance that the process of peaceful change should be resumed as soon as possible through the restoration of dialogue and negotiation, with the aim of achieving a democratic, non-racist and united South Africa.

The South African people should know that they may rely on the solidarity of the Spanish Government and people in their efforts to attain that goal. We trust that on the basis of this important debate the firm solidarity of the international community in pursuing that goal will also be made manifest.

These meetings of the Security Council, called for at such an opportune

(Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo, Spain)

time by the Organization of African Unity, will enable the international community to contribute positively to putting an end to violence and ensuring that all parties can return to the negotiating table under conditions that will make it possible to move decisively towards a far-reaching change of political structures in South Africa.

Accordingly, we fully support the text of the draft resolution that members of the Council have before them, and in particular the initiative to invite the Secretary-General to appoint, as a matter of urgency, a Special Representative to recommend, after discussion with the parties, measures which would assist in bringing an effective end to the violence and in creating conditions for successful negotiations.

Spain, together with its partners in the European Community, will support in every way possible the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative along those lines. To that end the Spanish Government is already redoubling its diplomatic efforts and its contacts with all the parties.

In conclusion, Spain wishes to join the international community in calling upon all the parties in South Africa, and especially the South African Government, to create suitable conditions to resume negotiations within the framework of CODESA, with the aim of ensuring a peaceful transition to a truly democratic and non-racist South Africa - in particular, at the appropriate time, through the establishment of a transitional government.

Attaining that goal will enable South Africa fully to take its rightful place in the region and the international community, which would surely have positive implications for the African continent and the whole world.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Spain for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUSUKA (Zambia): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. You are an eminent representative of a friendly African country which remains committed to the just struggle against apartheid and to the establishment of a democratic and non-racial South Africa. It is thus fitting that this body is considering the serious situation prevailing in South Africa under your able leadership.

To your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme of Belgium, I wish to extend the sincere appreciation of my delegation for the excellent manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of June.

Mr. President, may I, at the outset, thank you and the other members of the Security Council for acceding to my delegation's request to participate in this important debate.

My delegation's task in this debate has been greatly facilitated by the important statements made by the leaders of the liberation movements in South Africa, notably, Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress (ANC) and Mr. Clarence Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), as well as by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, who spoke on behalf of the current Chairman of the Organization of the African Unity (OAU).

At the recent summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) which was held in Dakar, Senegal, the participants expressed grave concern at

(Mr. Musuka, Zambia)

the escalating violence in South Africa targeted at black communities and progressive forces, with the aim of undermining their influence at the negotiating table and, in particular, at the recent massacre at Boipatong Township on 17 June 1992. The conferees strongly condemned the spate of violence and demanded a full and open investigation of the cause of the violence and the role of the security forces in the perpetration of this and other incidents.

The conferees also called for the urgent convening of the Security Council to examine the issue of violence in South Africa and to put an end to it as well as to create conditions for negotiations leading to a peaceful transition to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. In this regard, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was also invited to monitor closely the evolution of the situation in South Africa and to take all necessary measures.

It is a source of satisfaction to my delegation that, by convening these meetings, the Security Council has given an affirmative expression to the call made by the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unit (OAU). It is our expectation that it will act in conformity with the position of the African leaders which fully reflects the aspirations of the people of South Africa. Needless to say, the aspirations of the people of South Africa towards an end to apartheid and the establishment of non-racial democracy are embodied in numerous resolutions of the United Nations and in many decisions adopted by this Council during the past 45 years.

It is evident from the numerous statements made during this debate that the escalating violence in South Africa has grave consequences for the attainment of a just and peaceful solution to the problems of South Africa.

(Mr. Musuka, Zambia)

In this regard, Zambia remains gravely concerned at the growing violence in South Africa. We are also deeply concerned by the persistent allegations and evidence of complicity of the State security forces as highlighted in numerous court trials, inquests and commissions. This evidence has been confirmed by the Goldstone Commission and by several reports of independent international fact-finding missions.

Zambia strongly condemns the massacre at Boipatong, as well as other forms of violence which now threaten the peace process under the auspices of the Conference for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA). We deplore the perpetration of acts of violence by all means, including the use of the so-called traditional weapons which have been the major source of violence in the black townships.

We recognize and reaffirm that the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order lies with the Government of South Africa. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the South African authorities to take the necessary measures to end the violence immediately. The South African Government must discharge its responsibility and be seen to do so. It is clear that the South African authorities have the capacity and the resources to end the violence, to prosecute the perpetrators and to protect the lives of all South Africans. We call on South Africa to do so in conformity with its obligations and commitments. We urge all the parties to ensure the effective implementation of their commitments under the National Peace Accord.

In this regard, my delegation strongly appeals for unity and solidarity among the anti-apartheid forces and to direct their efforts at the early attainment of their common objectives.

(Mr. Musuka, Zambia)

It is our conviction that the end of violence would create a climate conducive to peaceful negotiations, including the resumption of the negotiating process under CODESA, for no meaningful negotiations can take place in the prevailing climate of violence. For this reason, it is understandable that the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) has suspended its participation in CODESA.

The whole international community is following with keen interest the situation in South Africa. At this critical time in the history of that country, the South African Government should be seen to be acting in good faith, in compliance with the conditions set forth in the United Nations Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa. The people of South Africa need peace; the people of southern Africa need peace. But peace cannot be achieved unless there is genuine commitment by all parties concerned to work for it.

(Mr. Musuka, Zambia)

There can be no doubt that there is a need for an early resumption of the peace process under CODESA. As things stand now, the situation is so volatile that any further provocation could spark off a very dangerous mass reaction with serious implications for the entire region of southern Africa. At the present moment, there is no measure of mutual confidence, as other representatives have actually said, and also of trust among the principal parties to the CODESA peace process. In such circumstances, it is virtually impossible to resume negotiations. My delegation, therefore, supports the call by the liberation movements of South Africa which was endorsed by the Summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its recent meeting at Dakar, Senegal, for the United Nations Secretary-General to appoint, as a matter of urgency, a Special Representative to investigate the underlying causes of the ongoing violence; make recommendations on the measures for bringing the violence to an end; and continue to monitor the developments in South Africa and to keep the Secretary-General informed, as appropriate.

My delegation is of the view that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General should, upon his appointment, proceed immediately to South Africa so that his report may be considered soon by the Security Council.

The United Nations has an abiding responsibility to ensure peaceful change in South Africa. It must continue to play a role until the situation in that country is declared irreversible by the representatives of the majority of that country. Thus, as provided for under the Declaration, the Secretary-General will continue to submit reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly on the progress in its implementation.

It is undeniable that since the adoption, on 14 December 1989, of the Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa,

(Mr. Musuka, Zambia)

significant progress has been made towards the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations. This has led to the lifting of some of the measures that had been imposed against South Africa. In fact, the commencement of the CODESA peace process seemed to hold promise for a peaceful transition to a democratic South Africa. However, as the situation now stands, the question of violence remains the greatest obstacle to negotiations in South Africa.

Violence has the potential to derail the whole process, an eventuality with ghastly consequences for South Africa in particular and the entire region in general, including my country, Zambia.

A bloody confrontation in South Africa can be avoided. We are of the view that President De Klerk holds the key to peace. The black majority have shown their continued willingness to negotiate in good faith. For the peace process to succeed, the Government must also demonstrate its declared good intentions very clearly. In fact, in terms of the provisions of the Declaration, the South African authorities are under obligation to create a climate that is conducive to negotiations. This it must do if chaos is to be averted. A complete breakdown in the negotiations is not, I repeat, in the interest of anyone at all. It would be a tragedy for Africa and the world at large if peace were to elude us at this critical juncture.

In conclusion, we wish to appeal to the Security Council to support the draft resolution before it. In so doing, the Council will be sending an unequivocal message to South Africa that the situation in that country is of interest to the international community. The Council can demand nothing less than South Africa's total compliance with its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on apartheid. Let the Council act now before the situation in South Africa gets out of control.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zambia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. KHARRAZI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am pleased and heartened that you, Sir, are presiding over this important deliberation that involves not only Africa, of which you are a distinguished son, but also the entire international community and its sense of civilization and democracy. May I also express appreciation to His Excellency Ambassador Noterdaeme for his skilful leadership of the Council during the month of June.

The presence of so many Foreign Ministers and leaders from Africa, particularly Mr. Nelson Mandela, who personifies tireless struggle and bravery, and also Mr. Clarence Makwetu, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, in itself clearly demonstrates the importance of the subject at hand and the widespread danger that threatens not only South Africa but the surrounding States as well.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The continued loss of life resulting from the violence raging in South Africa is unacceptable. The violence is now aimed at destabilizing democratic forces and communities in general. The recent situation raises grave concerns about the control which the regime exerts over the security forces. In this context, many reports point to the involvement of elements of the security forces and the extreme right in fostering this persisting violence. Ultimately, however, the Government of South Africa bears full responsibility. As a result, the establishment of a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa is seriously threatened.

At this very sensitive juncture, the international community should immediately take all measures necessary to put an end to the violence and to develop a mechanism for monitoring the situation in South Africa, so that constructive negotiation may resume and pave the ground for eradicating, once and for all, the system of apartheid.

In this connection, the international community in general and the Security Council in particular should ensure that negotiations will start on the basis of a truly democratic framework accepted by all parties involved. The minority Government in South Africa should be encouraged to accept this democratic framework for resumed negotiation and forgo its effort to guarantee its superiority over the majority black population by insisting on veto power.

Since the adoption of the consensus Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in South Africa at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, the issue of eradicating the South African regime's racist policies has been monitored by the international community, especially by the United Nations. The Declaration has called for the creation of an

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

appropriate climate for negotiations in order to establish a democratic and non-racial South Africa, based on a new constitution. The international community should not relax the existing measures against the apartheid regime before achieving this goal.

In the past three years, some positive developments have taken place. These include the release of some political prisoners, including Mr. Nelson Mandela; the lifting of the state of emergency and certain discriminatory legislation; the return of a number of political exiles; and, finally, the beginning of negotiation within the framework of CODESA.

Despite these developments, the apartheid system, which is a sore spot on the conscience of humanity and a crime against it, is still in place. The deprived people of South Africa continue to suffer from this racist system. Hundreds of political prisoners are still secretly held in South African jails. Many people were killed or injured as a result of the ruthless and systematic actions of the South African security forces.

This reign of violence has been systematically on the rise since January 1992. More than 7,000 people are said to have been killed since February 1990. The victims fall into different categories. According to the annex to document S/24232, violence in South Africa targeting black communities has escalated, a recent example of which is the massacre that took place in Boipatong Township on the night of 17 June 1992. The international community holds the Government of South Africa responsible and demands that it immediately stop the violence and protect the life and property of all South Africans.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Despite the fact that death and injury on such a scale represents a national emergency, the response of the authorities of the South African regime has been totally inadequate, to say the least. The continuation of the recent cycle of violence seriously jeopardizes the process of peaceful negotiations and the transition towards a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. Who benefits from this continued violence? Only the privileged minority that sees its interests at risk when the process of peaceful negotiations towards a more human and non-racial state of affairs in South Africa gains momentum. In this connection, the indifferent reaction of the South African Government raises some questions. The importance of fulfilling its duty to maintain peace and public safety should be impressed upon that Government.

It is clear that the international community cannot be content with the extent of recent changes in South Africa. The total eradication of all apartheid policies and the emergence of respect for the fundamental principles of equal rights for all human beings, regardless of color or race, is essential. To achieve this goal, maintaining sanctions, in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly, against the present regime should diligently continue as the major element of the international community's stance on South Africa. We believe that the international community, while condemning the escalation of violence in South Africa, particularly the massacre at Boipatong Township, must make the necessary decisions to bring such violence to an early end and monitor the developments in South Africa until apartheid is eradicated.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

My Government fully supports the efforts of the Secretary-General and the use of his good offices in South Africa as requested by the Organization of African Unity. The United Nations must continue to search for ways and means to stop the violence and help expedite the process of democratic negotiation in order to transform South Africa into a non-racial and democratic country. In this connection, the appointment and dispatch of the Secretary-General's Special Representative to South Africa represents a positive first step, one which will allow for a truly independent investigation of the violence and general situation in South Africa. The United Nations and the Security Council should nevertheless remain actively seized of the matter in order to ensure South Africa's smooth transition to a democratic and non-racial country.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has been carefully following the developments in South Africa and is gravely concerned. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has consistently helped mobilize and support international efforts aimed at eliminating apartheid's inhuman and racist policies. Furthermore, the Islamic Republic of Iran has unfailingly cooperated with various international bodies in order to strengthen the implementation of sanctions against South Africa.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the view that only by concerted action can the abhorrent system of apartheid be dismantled. To achieve this objective, drafting a new constitution with the participation of all patriotic representative groups in South Africa on the basis of an agreed framework is necessary to establish a democratic, non-racial and united country. Today, more than ever, the world is ready for the elimination of violence and racism.

This is the least that the international community should do to alleviate the suffering of the oppressed people of South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Italy. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July.

The significant changes brought about in South Africa in recent years have been warmly welcomed by my country. Indeed, the period has been fertile in terms of political events which could result in a decisive turn towards the establishment of a truly democratic and non-racial Government. In this context, I should like to express the deep appreciation of my Government for the gradual legislative dismantling of apartheid and for the negotiations that have taken place in the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA).

However, the reason for our debate today is, unfortunately, not a joyful one. In recent months there has been an alarming increase of violence in South Africa, culminating in the appalling incidents in Boitapong, which has taken a heavy toll of innocent human lives. Furthermore, there has been a break in the negotiation process. Italy is deeply concerned at the deterioration of the political climate and strongly urges all components of South African society - the Government, the police and the parties representing all South Africans involved in the CODESA process - to do their utmost to stop the cycle of violence in a joint endeavour to pacify the situation.

For the same reasons, Italy appeals to all parties concerned for a prompt resumption of the negotiations in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa. The important achievements which have been made so far should not be lost, and the process towards a non-racial democracy representative of all South Africans must be safeguarded and continued.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

The international community follows with the utmost interest the developments in South Africa, and the current debate in this Chamber is clear evidence of that interest. Allow me to recall in that context the constructive role played by the European Community, as demonstrated, inter alia, by the dimensions of its special programme of assistance to the victims of apartheid and by the forthcoming visit to South Africa of the troika of the Foreign Ministers of the Community.

For the same reason, Italy strongly hopes that the draft resolution which will be adopted today, by supporting the continuing use by the Secretary-General of his good offices and by inviting him to appoint a special representative, will actively contribute to encouraging all the parties concerned to set about resolving their differences by means of a sincere dialogue aimed at creating a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Italy for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Bantu Holomisa, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I am calling upon Mr. Bantu Holomisa who will speak in his personal capacity. This does not in any way entail the recognition by the Council or any of its members of the organization or entity he claims to represent.

I invite Mr. Holomisa to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. HOLOMISA: First, I should like to thank the Council for this opportunity to join its debate this afternoon.

As the Council is assembled here today to examine the scourge of violence in South Africa, we need first to define violence in the context of the South African social, economic and political situation. The apartheid system and white domination have always been underpinned by maximum State violence ruthlessly employed to coerce the unrepresented majority of South Africans to yield willy-nilly to white rule.

What Mr. De Klerk has done between 1990 and today is to restore South Africa, in the political sense, to the pre-1960 era, when political organizations enjoyed freedom of movement, association and assembly. Legally, he has taken South Africa to the pre-1948 period, when apartheid had not yet been legalized and institutionalized. Blacks did not have the right to vote during either of those periods, and they do not enjoy that right now.

His overriding concern now is to compete with the liberation movements for influence with the international community, displace them as a factor and render them ineffective. The regime's intransigence has precipitated the impasse in the negotiations. President De Klerk, of course, met his allies before CODESA 2 and pledged to slow down the pace of negotiations. At CODESA 2 he insisted on extremely high special majority percentages, which he knew would not be accepted by South Africans.

It is argued in other circles that the present Government of the Republic of South Africa is not a colonial one, in which case the international community would be justified to intervene, as was the case in Namibia and Zimbabwe. I submit that South Africa is a sovereign, independent State, but

(Mr. Holomisa)

that the transfer of power by the mother country, Britain, in 1910 to the white minority qualifies the present South African Government as a colonial administration, for the indigenous people of South Africa are denied self-determination in all organs of the governing process.

I note its current strategy of attempting to co-opt liberation movements so as to make them share the current blame for violence and other issues. The destabilization of black communities does not end with the black townships. It extends to the homeland Governments that are considered averse to the dirty tricks of the National Party Government and to its propensity to deploy its forces against unarmed and innocent blacks.

The Transkei Government, which has fully aligned itself with the broad democratic movement, has been particularly targeted for financial strangulation by the Government of the Republic of South Africa for more than two consecutive financial years, in a bid to force it to toe the line. Last year, for instance, our budget was approved by South Africa in October instead of April, and in March this year we were told to close our books. This year's budget, for 1992-1993, has not yet been approved. What would members call that? Is it not destabilization? It is indeed, I submit, political blackmail aimed at causing our local population to become disenchanted with the Government through deliberately engineered mass starvation and thus to contemplate an uprising.

This strategy has been pursued since 1988-1989; it culminated in an abortive coup on 22 November 1990. All available evidence in the Supreme Court of Transkei - manned by seconded South African judges - so far points to South Africa's complicity from the hatching of the coup to its staging. To

(Mr. Holomisa)

corroborate the fact that the white South African Government employs mercenaries to achieve its nefarious political objectives, I would note that the failed coup attempt against Transkei was spearheaded by members of the "Lesotho Liberation Army", trained, funded and equipped by the South African Government to overthrow the Government of the late Chief Lebua Jonathan of the Kingdom of Lesotho.

(Mr. Holomisa)

Those men are in the custody of the Transkei Government and appearing in court facing treason charges. The Lesotho Liberation Army members confirmed in court our intelligence reports to President De Klerk in 1990 that a farm belonging to a certain Mr. Van Tonder in Queenstown, bordering Transkei in the west, was used for training and as an assembly point whence the men departed to kill sleeping Transkei Defence Force recruits, using mortars.

The State order for the assassination of Goniwe and others was revealed through my office as a result of an authentic document anonymously addressed to me. Today I also have in my possession a thick file sent in the same manner. The day I decide to release it that will prove beyond doubt that white South Africa is an expert on destabilizing black communities, resulting in bloodshed and loss of human life, in order to facilitate its stay in power.

The history of South Africa's political minefields shows that the South African Government denies knowledge of everything in which it is involved only for it to be proved later that it committed serious offences, as in the case of Goniwe and others, Trust Feeds, the Inkathagate scandal and the support for the UNITA and RENAMO forces.

When the misdeeds and acts of omission and commission of the Government of the Republic of South Africa become public knowledge, it offers the feeble excuse that they took place in the past.

It would appear even in this negotiation process that the voteless and voiceless majority will depend on the attitudes, feelings, inclination and disposition of the De Klerk Government about what it can concede to blacks and what it can save for white supremacy.

We still doubt the unequivocal commitment of the South African Government to real change - that is, to accede to one person, one vote, which is the

(Mr. Holomisa)

basis of majority rule. Every bit of evidence to date indicates that whatever changes De Klerk introduces are a result of a reaction to international and internal pressures. He seems over-anxious to placate the international community and polish and veneer South Africa's sordid image there so that South Africa is accepted back into its fold.

There is a growing perception among the victims of apartheid that the South African Government's decision to unban all liberation movements stems from a desire to maintain a two-way communication with them - that is, to negotiate with them on the one hand and to weaken them on the other. It weakens them by failing to comply with the agreements reached with them and in this way discredits them in the eyes of their supporters.

The collusion of vigilante groups with the South African security forces in spreading civil mayhem in black communities, as has been witnessed in the black townships, is another pointer to South Africa's determination to have the upper hand in the negotiations with some of its homeland Government allies.

The sudden springing up, emergence and proliferation of politial parties in certain black areas is the direct outcome of a carefully pre-conceived plan to confuse and catch people and use them as voting cattle for the future Nationalist Party-led grand alliance against the liberation movements.

Another source of concern is the impression that negotiations are an affair for the tripartite group - that is, the ANC, the Nationalist Party and Inkatha only. This impression must be corrected, as there are the PAC, AZAPO and other political parties in the homelands which enjoy equal status with KwaZulu's Chief Minister, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi.

(Mr. Holomisa)

We have learned from the African experience that the exclusion of other political formations from the negotiation process leading to freedom and independence results in political instability and insurrection.

Members of the international community, such as this body, should exercise caution when it comes to the issue of rewards. They should avoid taking unilateral decisions without consulting the South African black protagonists on punitive measures against the country lest these organisations are viewed as stabbing the oppressed black masses in the back, as was the case in 1910.

We do not want to conclude that there is a premeditated strategy to inflict severe political defeat on blacks by De Klerk and his allies with the full backing of the international community.

I have a strong feeling that the political fortunes and settlement of the South African dilemma are tied to Angola and Mozambique. The armed UNITA and RENAMO bandits trained, equipped and funded by South Africa and some of its Western allies must, it appears, be safely placed in power before our country is propelled to a non-racial democracy. The cold war may have come to an end, but its ripple effects are still painfully felt in South Africa by the victims of apartheid. This scenario derives from the fear of the ascension to power of a party favourably disposed to the two countries which will swiftly move to take drastic action and halt the flow of aid, supplies and logistical support to the rebel movements and thereby foil the entire grand strategy of seeking to install in power henchmen of international vested interests.

We urge the international community to take a fresh look at the unfolding scenario in South Africa and heed the pertinent facts I have canvassed. If these issues are ignored South Africa will slide into chaos and anarchy, and a

(Mr. Holomisa)

bloody conflict will ensue. Already southern Africa is bleeding due to the lack of growth in South Africa's economy. There is no hope for regional cooperation at both the political and economic levels as long as the intractable problem and vexed question of South Africa is not addressed.

It is our considered position that the presence of the international community in South Africa will become effective and meaningful only when it has a direct say over the negotiation process. It must be invested with mandatory powers to intervene and arbitrate between the parties jockeying for power.

To avert further racial polarization because of the anger and frustration with the impasse in CODESA the international community should set out to help all sides to accelerate the pace of change within carefully determined time-frames.

The international peace-keeping force, whose dispatch to South Africa we clamour for, can discharge its duties honourably and to the satisfaction of all only when its endeavours to restore peace and calm to the strife-torn areas are accompanied and matched by visible and tangible progress in constitutional negotiations.

Once an international body to play a peace-keeping role in South Africa has been identified its duties should include:

First, dispatching an advance team to the country to meet various leaders with a view to acquainting itself with all the problems besetting South Africa and its created independent homelands;

Secondly, looking into the general stability of the whole country, concentrating on rural areas where there is absolutely no free politicking in some homelands;

(Mr. Holomisa)

Thirdly, helping create a free political climate to facilitate the mobilization of support by all political parties and organizations;

Fourthly, helping identify all foreign mercenaries in the employ of the South African Defence Force and repatriating them to their countries of origin;

Fifthly, monitoring Armscor, which produces arms in South Africa, and its agents and preventing the flow of weapons from the South African Defence Force and South African Police stores to their surrogate forces;

Sixthly, monitoring the possibly extensive violation of the arms embargo, to check and establish whether the secret funds are used to purchase in foreign countries weapons which are used to kill blacks;

(Mr. Holomisa)

Seventhly, taking over the entire control of the National Peace Accord and revamping it, paying more attention to the following: the code of conduct and control of the State's armed forces; the control of the armed wings of the liberation movements as well as the white right-wing military formations. The right-wing military formations are openly training and publicly displaying their weapons.

The international community will have to address itself to Mr. de Klerk's assertion that there will be no interim government in South Africa if the liberation movements do not disband their military wings. This new attitude surprised many because the ANC in particular has suspended the armed struggle and has not engaged in hostile acts against Mr. de Klerk's Government. Mr. de Klerk stated, when unbanning the liberation movements, that their military wings were also unbanned.

The international community has to subject the De Klerk regime to an unceasing string of unrelenting and inexorable scrutiny of its bestial conduct regarding domestic developments since February 1990, namely the hand of the State in the incessant massacre of blacks and its unshakeable determination to frustrate the achievement of a negotiated settlement not acceptable to it.

To rebuild trust and foster the spirit of confidence in the resumption of negotiations after the graphic illustration of the regime's bad faith and hidden agendas highlighted above, the international community will have to consider the advisability of endorsing or ratifying built-in mechanisms to ensure that Mr. de Klerk and his cronies do not determine the pace of change and negotiations unilaterally as they have done at CODESA 2.

In conclusion, it is clear that there is no free politicking in South Africa today. This is exacerbated by the role of the State in fomenting

(Mr. Holomisa)

so-called black-on-black violence by deploying its security forces and surrogates to undermine the political strength of its opponents. It will serve no purpose for the international community to insist on the resumption of CODESA negotiations under existing arrangements and in the present climate. As long as the South African Government lets its hounds and wolves loose freely to devour unarmed and innocent blacks, negotiations will not get back on track.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker inscribed on my list is Mr. Essop Pahad, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. PAHAD: Allow me to thank you, Sir, and through you the Government of India, for the opportunity to address this important meeting of the Security Council. At the outset, on behalf of the South African Communist Party (SACP), I wish to express our regret at the tone and content of some of the contributions made this morning. Those who are part of the present system cannot, I suppose, but be expected to speak in the way they did. It does, however, also demonstrate that the governing structures in South Africa are not only the central Government: the Bantustan system is still very much with us.

To somebody who has been here in New York over the past few days witnessing the Democratic Party convention, it is of course acceptable that in the hurly-burly of politics candidates in the primaries in the Democratic Party would tend to tear each other from limb to limb, but it is unfortunate that a representative should use such an important meeting as today's to invoke old hairy and hoary anti-Communist shibboleths; one would have thought

(Mr. Pahad)

that at this present time we would be beyond that type of politicking. But since he seems to be rather badly informed, may I use this opportunity merely to inform him and his delegation that the South African Community Party has no secret members.

Over the past few years our country has been wracked by violence. In seeking to find explanations and solutions to this unacceptably high level of violence, we need to start from the premise that the violence could have been significantly reduced, if not avoided, if the South African police and the South African Defence Force had fulfilled their obligations to the citizens of our country, irrespective of their political and ideological positions and affiliations.

There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the security forces have not only failed in their duties and obligations but played an active part in the fomenting and escalation of violence.

It is clear to us that the involvement of those security forces, both individually and collectively, has been to further the violence by taking political sides. These actions have resulted in the death and mutilation of thousands of persons, as well as the destruction of property.

The violence in South Africa is not, as I think some people are saying, black-on-black violence. It emanates from a corrupt, discredited system. Presumably, one would not speak about what is happening in the old Yugoslavia as Slav-on-Slav violence, or white-on-white violence.

It is a matter of grave concern that the South African regime continues to allocate R5 billion for covert operations in a context in which it claims that it seeks a negotiated solution. Quite clearly, this vast sum of money

(Mr. Pahad)

could be better utilized to help deal with the appalling and outrageous levels of poverty, hunger and malnutrition stalking our country.

There have also been in the course of this morning's discussion a number of comments made about mass action. It would seem to us that mass struggles are a central element of a democratic society, so long as those mass actions are peaceful and within the law. But, quite clearly, the law itself should not be an ass. However, in reviewing the context in which mass action and mass struggles occur in South Africa, we need to take into account that the balance of forces in South Africa can be defined as, on the one hand, having a national party regime which controls all of the instruments of oppression and all of the State institutions, while, on the other hand, the democratic forces have only the one power, the potential power of the masses of our people.

(Mr. Pahad)

It is in this context, I think, that we also need to view the mass struggle.

Incidentally, the influence of the South African Communist party is not as sinister as it is made out to be. After all, it was our delegation that proposed the name CODESA and it seems to me the rest of the people accepted the name.

This brings me to the question of negotiations. I think we need to reiterate what our objective has been. The objective of the ANC-led alliance in the negotiation process has been to seek the transfer of power from a white majority regime into the hands of the people. It is not to seek the transfer of power into the hands of the ANC or anybody else. That, I think, is the first critical element that we need to look at.

Therefore, it is the people of South Africa that must decide who should govern them. This to us, if you like, is the nub of the breakdown in CODESA. We cannot conceive of a continuation of the negotiation process in CODESA until we can get a clear and unambiguous statement from the National Party regime that they are prepared to accept a constitution which gives the right to the people of South Africa to decide who should govern them, with no qualifications entrenched in a future constitution of power-sharing arrangements.

Therefore, if we penetrate beneath this dense bush of verbiage and remove the obfuscation around CODESA and the negotiating process, we will come clearly to understand that what separates us from the National Party regime is the fact that we want a democratic South Africa in which the people will not only have the right to choose their own Government but certainly have the right to reject it in a subsequent election.

(Mr. Pahad)

We think that if the international community is to intervene on this question, then the intervention has to be in the direction of giving to South Africa what every other democratic society enjoys: I repeat, the right of a people to elect its own Government and, equally, the right of the people to reject that Government. This is the issue that separates us in CODESA. All other issues can be negotiated and are subsidiary to that, which means, and I repeat again, that we cannot find acceptable power-sharing arrangements to be enshrined in any new constitution.

In my closing remarks, let me say this: We are either on the threshold of fundamental change in South Africa or we are on the brink of an abyss. If the violence persists in our country and if we are unable to reduce this unacceptably high level of violence, we shall sink into the abyss. But if we can bring this violence to an end, if we can bring about a situation in which we can have free political activity in our country, then I think we will cross the Rubicon into a new South Africa.

It is in this context that the United Nations - the General Assembly and the Security Council - would need to consider intervention. Its intervention is significant and important. We think that it is vital that the international community begin to play a much more active role in the monitoring of the situation in South Africa. We think it is absolutely vital that the representative of the Secretary-General arrive as soon as possible in that country, for in the final analysis, this body, which has been seized of the situation in South Africa since 1946, has a duty and an obligation to all humanity to bring to an end, once and for all, this crime against humanity.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Philip Mahlangu, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAHLANGU: Before I salute you, I should like, in brief, to give my perception of an impression given.

There are no different voices coming from the black masses of South Africa. The question is that there are two voices caused by the Government. There are those people who would speak for the Government because they are Government-backed and Government-supported; and there are those who speak on behalf of South Africa's suffering, oppressed masses.

I could go further and indicate when someone actually began to attack the African National Congress, because that, from his position, would be defending the apartheid-structured base. This is a cause for concern.

I am not defending the African National Congress, but we in the Intando Yesizwe and of course the Patriotic Front led by the African National Congress have always said that we have to go for a fair and free election in our country so as to allow our people to have a say in the constitution that affects their lives on a daily basis.

Then the African National Congress of course would be attacked because most of the Parties and Government-backed structures are regional, and the African National Congress is national or international.

Another point I want to make is that the people of South Africa will, at the end of the day, have to decide who is to rule or govern them - not the people who will come to the United Nations Security Council to give an impression of how bad the other organizations are. I do not think that is the

(Mr. Mahlangu)

aim of coming here, but of course the National Party's allies would have it no other way.

On behalf of His Royal Highness the Prince, it gives my Party immeasurable pleasure to be afforded the rare privilege of addressing your highly honoured and credible body. May I then, on behalf of the Intando Yesizwe Party, extend our unreserved gratitude to His Excellency the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his highly sensible response to our cries in South Africa. We also thank all those who put their weight behind the convening of this body. This meeting could not come at a better time.

We wish to state in no uncertain terms that there is serious social disorder in our country which we are trying to address. For us to address this social disorder in a more meaningful way, the contribution of the international community has become indispensable. I will emphasize this point later.

(Mr. Mahlangu)

The people of South Africa are faced with a serious challenge: moving from an era of apartheid, in which political power is exclusively in the hands of the white minority, to an era of democracy in which the majority of the people have input into how their country is run - and this includes the currently ruling whites. Regrettably, the move towards the latter era has been effectively thwarted by those whose political survival depends on either delaying or blocking outright the democratic process.

The policy of apartheid, or racial segregation, has not only brutalized and dehumanized the black people of South Africa, but also forcibly plunged the majority of our people into abysmal socio-economic conditions and forced blacks into economically and socially unviable ethnic entities - known as homelands, national states or Bantustans - in stark contrast to the living conditions of whites.

These unbearable, apartheid-specific conditions still prevail. All political power is still in the hands of the white minority, and all economic power is still in the hands of a few whites. The majority of blacks are still on the side of the job-performers, while the majority of whites are on the side of the job-providers. Most blacks are still inadequately housed or even homeless. Different races still have different educational systems. This list, which clearly reflects South Africa's social inequities, is too long for this Council to listen to, so I will cut it short.

The National Party, which has ruled our country since 1948, still governs on the basis of apartheid. As it is logical that one should protect the policies one believes in, the South African Government has over the years effectively protected apartheid at all costs, be it by military means, with security forces or even through other, non-public operations. As we have seen

(Mr. Mahlangu)

in the media, those who object to apartheid are subject to arrest, conviction, torture, harassment and even execution.

With the signing of the National Peace Accord by many parties and organizations in September, as well as the establishment of CODESA last December, we were decidely optimistic. We who participated in CODESA, and our followers, came to believe that a new era of negotiations was dawning; that South Africa was moving away from apartheid towards an era of democracy. We were hopeful that peace and stability would come to our land.

But the Peace Accord and CODESA only fanned the flames: violence flared as never before. Examples of this violence, such as the Boipatong massacre, have been mentioned by other speakers.

Credible sources report that the principal source of conflict and violence in South Africa is the policy of apartheid, which since 1948 has been planned, nurtured and even financed by the very party that is governing South Africa today. It is therefore extremely difficult for the Government to convince anyone, save itself, that it is no longer doing this. It stretches credibility even further to ask the people to believe that the Government is unable to control the violence, considering the military and security forces it has at its disposal.

The people tend to believe, therefore, that since apartheid has served the interests of the Government since 1948, its continued existence, even with some minor, well-managed though mostly ineffective changes, will still serve those interests best.

Considering that most indicators point to the Government as responsible for much of the violence; that it is difficult to believe that this Government is now prepared to completely abandon apartheid and apartheid-created power;

(Mr. Mahlangu)

that it seems unlikely that it is negotiating in good faith, and that it seems as if the Government is trying to manipulate CODESA in order to entrench its position in the future dispensation, as well as ensure maximum economic advantages for the white minority, it became evident to us in the Intando Yesizwe Party (IYP) that CODESA was not going to deliver the goods. We believe that CODESA will not succeed unless the international community intervenes.

Our decision not to continue with CODESA was therefore based on the following conditions: a decisive end to the violence; establishment of an international violence-monitoring body; the effective disbanding of private Government operations such as Koevoet; and the Government's abandonment of its intransigent position in CODESA, while undertaking to enter into good-faith negotiations as a true partner. This decision was simply a response to the frustrating political state of affairs prevailing in South Africa.

We are now making an urgent appeal to the United Nations Security Council to consider our situation as warranting urgent international intervention, and to send a high-powered monitoring committee with the following goals: to monitor, investigate and report to the Secretary-General on the violence in South Africa, with special emphasis on its causes and perpetrators; to make recommendations to the Secretary-General on decisive steps that need to be taken by the United Nations to end the violence and thus make way for effective negotiations; to investigate and report to the Secretary-General on the advisability and necessity of having permanent United Nations observers in CODESA; and advise, report and make recommendations on any matter that could ensure South Africa's smooth transition to a nation that will offer a better future for all people.

(Mr. Mahlangu)

On behalf of my leader, His Royal Highness the Prince, I should like to say that we appreciate your generosity in listening to our side of the issue, and we further ask that when you come to South Africa you consult all the parties involved. Indeed, as I said earlier, there are parties that will not condemn apartheid as long as they are in positions of power. However, the opinion of the people within a particular jurisdiction is certainly a relevant factor; hence the importance of consulting all the parties involved.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Ukraine, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to thank you and all the other members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to address the Council.

The 1989 adoption of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa gave rise to the hope that the crisis in that region would be settled peacefully, through negotiations. The Declaration, which expressed the consensus position of the entire international community, called for the creation in South Africa of the

> "necessary climate in which free political discussions can take place - an essential condition to ensure that the people themselves participate in the process of remaking their country" (General Assembly resolution S-16/1, para. 7).

While political activity was subsequently facilitated by the release of many political prisoners, the setting in motion of the return of political exiles and the partial repeal of repressive legislation, free political expression and the process of negotiations itself have been severely hampered by the wave of violence that has engulfed the country.

This confirms once more the conclusion that apartheid is a crime against humanity and as such should be eradicated, root and branch.

The violence has escalated during the last few months, reaching unprecedented and tragic levels. The Boipatong tragedy is but one more piece of evidence of the deteriorating political situation in South Africa.

Inspired by the best of hopes and expectations, the international community overrated the positive developments in South Africa and

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

underestimated the seriousness of the remaining problems. We linked our hopes to the very encouraging document signed in September 1991, the National Peace Accord. If its provisions were carried out in practice, this would obviously help stop the violence in South Africa. But now we observe the gap widening between intentions and practice. More than 1,700 victims have been killed since the signing of the National Peace Accord.

Unfortunately, it seems that we gave a wrong signal to the authorities in question - or that they misunderstood our signal. One way or another, we can and should correct our mistake.

In that connection, it comes to mind that the Security Council has adopted measures against a country that failed to take proper action against two alleged international terrorists. Against that backdrop, one can only imagine what kind of measures might be adopted, if the Security Council were consistent, against someone who failed to take proper action against terrorists, not once but in thousands of cases; against someone who uses international mercenaries and hit squads and who carries out terrorist actions abroad, and who is doing nothing to prosecute the perpetrators of crimes.

I have just returned from international hearings on political violence in South Africa and on the implementation of the National Peace Accord, held yesterday and the day before in London. Two hundred and fifty persons from 27 countries participated in that event. Also present were 13 witnesses, some of them teenagers. Some had been shot; some of their compatriots had been killed. The witnesses escaped, and later appealed to the authorities in question for justice; they never received it.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

We heard from a man who had participated in covert operations aimed at killing members of the anti-apartheid movement. The witnesses spoke of an undeclared war against those who seek democracy. That war is waged in South Africa with the aim of preserving minority rule in whatever guise.

It is no wonder that under those circumstances the London hearings concluded that the primary responsibility for the political violence must rest with the authorities, since they failed to take effective measures to end it.

As I said, we gave a wrong signal. Now it is time to correct the image of the United Nations and of the Security Council, which last considered this problem in 1988. Let us send a crystal-clear signal of continuing pressure in order to stop the violence. The escalating violence in South Africa must be condemned.

If the violence is not stopped now, it could very easily run out of control and become endemic. Under those circumstances it would not be possible to hold free and fair elections on the basis of one person, one vote.

But the violence will never be brought under control if politicians of all parties, and the entire society, do not play their part. I repeat that, first of all, the Government of South Africa has to take effective action to stop the ongoing violence. Only the maintenance of law and order can guarantee security for the process of negotiations and the peaceful settlement of the problems of South Africa.

But at this stage, when the atmosphere of mutual mistrust prevails in the country, the international community has to play its role. There is an urgent

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

need for the intervention of truly independent investigators. There is a need for an international team to be sent to South Africa to monitor the cases of violence. South Africa and South Africans need international support and help, now and in the months to come, to build a new society in that country.

During the transitional period there should be local, regional and national elections, which will also require some form of international supervision to ensure that they are fair.

The parties to the CODESA negotiations have to realize that the international community has played a significant role in initiating the negotiating process in South Africa. Moreover, the country is seeking admission to the international community; if it wants credibility and legitimacy, it is in its own interest to make use of the wisdom, advice and experience of the United Nations.

The complexity of the transitional process in South Africa obviously calls for continuous wide-ranging support from the international community; that support can be effective only when properly coordinated. There is a need for a combined approach to the problems of political, social and economic development, the protection of human rights and the democratization of South African society.

In this context, the role of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Centre against Apartheid has to be increased. Some countries which have abstained from participation in that Committee's work are invited to reconsider their position and join with the Committee in its efforts to monitor implementation of the Declaration adopted by the special session of the General Assembly on apartheid.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

A mechanism should be created that would bring together the wisdom and political and economic power of the United Nations Member States, as well as the experience and potential of the United Nations Secretariat, for the benefit of the peaceful implementation of the goals of the transition in South Africa.

Ukraine believes that the international community and the United Nations have no right to be patient in the face of continued massive, grave infringements of human rights, against clear advice to the contrary.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

In conclusion, let me voice the hope that the Security Council will urge the international community to maintain the existing measures imposed for the purpose of bringing about an early end to apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Namibia, His Excellency Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GURIRAB (Namibia): May I first express to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. You and I have known each other for a number of years and have worked together on various issues of great importance, including those having to do with southern Africa. I am therefore confident that in your present task you will bring to bear your laudable diplomatic skills and political wisdom. I assure you of our support and cooperation as you exercise the functions of this high office at this critical moment, critical in particular for Africa and its peoples.

We also congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Noterdaeme of Belgium, on successfully guiding the Council's affairs last month.

I should like to take this opportunity also to express our warmest congratulations to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali on his unanimous election to the post of Secretary-General and to wish him well in his weighty duties.

I also recognize the presence of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Mr. Salim Ahmed Salim, whose wide experience in world affairs and deep knowledge of the United Nations will be indispensable in the consultations during the course of these meetings.

Let me dispel a little mischievous rumour I picked up, that because of

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

Namibia's place on the list of speakers I am now giving the last word on the subject. Far from it. You, Mr. President, will always have the last word in this Council, and we have here the Chairman of the OAU ministerial delegation, who will give the last word, if any last word is needed. After all, these are really meetings for South Africa and therefore for the people of South Africa themselves.

I had thought that when I made my maiden statement before the Security Council as the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Namibia it would be a pleasant occasion to report on the successful implementation of Security Council resolution 432 (1978) on the reintegration of Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands into the rest of Namibia. On that issue the Government of South Africa and the Government of Namibia started negotiations last year. Lately, however, these negotiations have become increasingly bogged down as a result of the usual obfuscation by the South African Government and its reneging on agreements previously reached. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the Namibian Government will find it unavoidable to bring the matter before the Council to seek assistance to secure early reintegration of Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands. So much on that subject for now.

Unexpectedly I now have to make my maiden statement instead on the tragic violence in South Africa. It is unexpected because it is more than four years since the Security Council last considered the question of South Africa or any issue relating to southern Africa, except for the last meeting on Namibia in 1989 to trigger the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). During the intervening period since 1988 significant and welcome developments have taken place in southern Africa, Namibia's independence has been achieved. We have

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

seen the end of the destabilization of independent States in southern Africa and the start of the peace process in South Africa, which led to the establishment of CODESA. We saw encouraging signs that gave optimism that genuine change was indeed finally at hand. These developments have given rise to high hopes and expectations that we have entered a new era of peace, cooperation and good-neighbourly relations in southern Africa and that these developments will replace the old order of colonialism, illegality, destabilization and apartheid.

The OAU Summit did not request the convening of these important meetings of the Security Council merely to level frivolous charges against the South African Government. Not only did the OAU and the frontline States welcome the positive developments that I have referred to, but they equally publicly commended the South African Government for steps taken in the right direction.

This time the OAU Summit sent a ministerial delegation, led by the representative of the OAU's current Chairman to present Africa's position to the Security Council on the situation in South Africa, which everyone has been talking about.

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

In this connection, the statement made yesterday by my brother and colleague, Djibo Ka, Foreign Minister of Senegal, eloquently and effectively presented Africa's position, and I associate my delegation with that statement. The additional serious and factual statements made by other colleagues, as well as by members of the Council and other delegations, underscored the urgency of addressing the escalating violence in South Africa.

The statements and the additional documentation made available to delegations, as well as the new revelations in the press on the prevailing situation in South Africa, attest to both the timeliness and importance of this meeting. I have no intention of repeating what has already been said, and in most cases effectively and convincingly, by some of the previous speakers. My intention is to add Namibia's perspective to the debate.

In this connection, the historical and colonial ties between South Africa and Namibia are well known to members of the Council. The Security Council itself adopted numerous resolutions on the subject of South Africa's colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia up to 1989. Against that background and also as a neighbour, Namibia considers it its duty to express concern about the carnage and instability driving South Africa to the brink of catastrophe, which, if not arrested in good time, could engulf the whole region and threaten international peace and security.

It breaks our hearts and causes us pain, in Namibia, to have seen many thousands of innocent men, women and children killed over the past several years. The available statistics show that since 1984 12,000 black South Africans have been killed; and the figure for 1990 is said to be a staggering 7,000. This magnitude of human suffering cannot be allowed to continue, for

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

the carnage we see in South Africa today and the heinous methods used are akin to genocide. It is distressing to note that the perpetrators of these dastardly acts either get off scot-free or are never brought to justice. But we remember that this was the same experience in Namibia.

I know what I am talking about. I feel a particular sense of outrage and anger, because some of these criminals who are in the service of the South Africa Government, particularly those belonging to the notorious Koevoet killer unit are Namibians. I have myself, more than a year ago on more than one occasion, brought to the attention of my neighbour and colleague, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, our concerns about the recruitment and deployment of Namibian citizens in the political violence being carried out against our South African brothers and sisters. Up to now I have received no reply. The most terrible and dramatic revelation is that a Koevoet unit carried out the massacre at Boipatong.

Our experience in dealing with the South African Government offers a relevant case study about the South African Government's sense of fair play and good faith in negotiations and in honouring agreements reached. The Boipatong massacre and other brutal acts against innocent South African people look like a replay of the Namibian experience.

We are questioning once again the credibility gap and bad faith of the Government of South Africa. A question posed yesterday by one of the speakers is worth repeating, and that is why the South African Government at this time - at a time of peace and at a time when the internal negotiations have already started, sees the need to maintain a huge army, air force and navy, plus various so-called security units, including an international mercenary

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

battalion. We want peace in our subregion - no more wars in southern Africa. This is a troubling question to which only the South Africa Government can give a satisfactory answer.

When President de Klerk took over the leadership of the National Party some three years ago and began to make rousing and constructive declarations full of confidence and characterized by a new vision for South Africa, we thought at that time that here was an Afrikaner, a politician with courage and a sense of mission, who was prepared to make a clean break with apartheid and its horrible past. But here we go again. Three years later one should not be blamed for cynicism if a question is asked: What is new? Where is the beef?

In 1990, the incumbent Namibian Government saw fit, inspired by the winds of change that were sweeping across the subregion, to extend an invitation to President de Klerk and his colleagues to join us on the occasion of the proclamation of independence of Namibia on 21 March 1990.

Since then we have tried, not without some serious difficulties to do business with the South African leadership. How could we do otherwise, since our country, to all intents and purposes, had been turned into a fifth province of the ex-colonial master's country. Furthermore, we still have quite a lot of unfinished business to settle between us.

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

We in Namibia unreservedly support a peaceful and negotiated end to apartheid in South Africa and the creation of a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. But at the same time, drawing on our own experience in dealing with the successive South African Governments, in the struggle, in negotiations and even during the transition, we maintain that the litmus test for assuring the resumption of the CODESA process is not only the ending of the current violence itself, but rather lies in the emplacement of effective and durable mechanisms to prevent the armed forces and security units from being used against opponents of the Government.

For example, in the case of Namibia the requirement was that prior to the start of the electoral process the then-existing security and other elements had to be confined to base and demobilized. This was deemed necessary in order to ensure an atmosphere free of violence and intimidation during the period of elections and constitution-making. Similar arangements, in our view, could be looked into for South Africa. Otherwise, even if and when, under the prevailing situation, the CODESA negotiations were to be resumed, their successful conclusion could not be assured.

All the Parties represented at CODESA received our letter urging them to give peace a chance and to work in earnest for a new constitution and a new South Africa. This is still our message to them.

I want to convey, in this debate, to my colleague the South African Foreign Minister, that we in Namibia want to see peace in South Africa. We want to see genuine negotiations commence. We want to see an ethic of give and take. We want to see a commitment to majority rule. We want to see national reconciliation. And we would like to welcome a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa into the fold of the community of southern

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

African States - for these are the cherished ideals which are enshrined in our own Constitution and which have been accepted by all the political parties represented in the National Assembly and by all sectors of our population.

Neither the election victory of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) nor the institution of majority rule in Namibia in any way whatsoever threatened the interests and well-being of any minority group in Namibia. The Constitution and the laws of the land protect us all as equal citizens of the Republic of Namibia.

The Foreign Minister of South Africa knows Namibian society as well as he knows his own and can personally confirm what I have just said. In the face of the challenges, real or imagined, confronting the South African Government, that Government must, in the first instance, summon courage and political will to be able to take bold and decisive decisions which will remove all the remaining impediments and pave the way towards a new and peaceful South Africa.

In the same vein, I must also renew a call for the South African liberation movements and all the other democratic forces, those at CODESA as well as other South African political formations and groups to eschew violence and embrace the negotiating process. But for this to happen, it is the primary responsibility of the South African Government to take prompt, concrete and decisive steps immediately in order to put an end to the tragic violence, which is a prerequisite for the resumption of negotiations. On the other hand, there is a special responsibility for the oppressed themselves to strengthen and consolidate unity within the framework of the Patriotic Front, which our delegation supports fully.

My delegation does not derive any satisfaction from engaging in polemics or name-calling. That is not the purpose of our participation in this

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

debate. We felt honoured and took it up as our patriotic duty when the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Summit included Namibia among the African countries designated to participate in this crucial debate. The meeting had to be requested because the grave situation now prevailing in South Africa warrants it. I do not believe that plain talk with concrete examples is an enemy of progress. On the contrary, I consider it a recipe for removing obstacles in the way of that very progress.

Perhaps as a sign of how much things have changed, we have an unprecedented situation as far as the South African participation in this meeting is concerned. Apart from the delegations of the South African Government and of the national liberation movements recognized by the United Nations which have been addressing the Security Council, the Council, in its wisdom, decided to afford the privilege of addressing it to some of the parties represented at CODESA. As far as this goes, the Namibian delegation sees no problem in this development. I must, however, say that it would be a sad commentary and a sign of utter insensitivity, given the grave situation we are witnessing in South Africa, to turn this important meeting of the Security Council into a useless session of posturing or a battleground for unfinished CODESA business.

It is my delegation's earnest hope that, though divided politically, all South African patriots will on this occasion rise above party politics and endeavour to renew their commitment to do everything possible, firstly, to end violence and, secondly, to remove all the remaining obstacles that may, now or in the future, once again derail the peace process.

In particular, my delegation and I would like to urge the South African Government to leave no stone unturned, in consultation and in cooperation with

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

the other parties concerned, to demonstrate leadership and show courage so that the negotiations can be resumed. There is goodwill and willingness on the part of the OAU and, no doubt, other international bodies, to lend support to all serious and genuine efforts by the South African Government to meet the standards of democracy and good government expected of it by the international community.

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

Some of the statements made here today do not befit the stature of the Security Council; they will not help the healing or reconciliation necessary to establish an interim government and a constituent assembly.

The allegation of black-on-black violence is an old trick that the oppressor has used over the centuries to discredit his opponents. Referring to victims as villains is as old as the history of colonialism and, in the present situation, as old as apartheid itself. We heard of it no so long ago in Zimbabwe, and most recently in Namibia. Perhaps all the parties concerned may be blamed, one way or another, for whatever transgression; apartheid is not dead yet. The required conditions for irreversible, profound change do not exist in South Africa at the present time. This, then, is the root cause of apartheid, and that is the cause of the violence we are seeing today, which threatens to destroy the life and property in South Africa.

This debate and the draft resolution before the Council clearly indicate the convergence of views between the OAU and the Security Council concerning the events in South Africa.

I welcome the sentiments expressed by some members of the Council on the initiative taken by the OAU in calling this meeting.

Happily, we also note that various intergovernmental bodies such as the European Community, the Commonwealth and others have already taken initiatives similar to those already taken or being contemplated by either the OAU or the United Nations.

This unmistakable, broad consensus on the situation in South Africa should send a clear and categorical message to the South African Government: that, on the one hand, the escalating violence is unacceptable, and that the South African Government and it alone is expected to stop it; and that, on the

(Mr. Gurirab, Namibia)

other hand, there is a readiness to help normalize the situation. In this context, the draft resolution before this Council, which reinforces the recent OAU resolution, provides a necessary first step towards a meaningful United Nations role. This step should be followed by a more permanent mechanism: a monitoring group that will remain in the country until a new constitution is adopted.

My delegation further notes with satisfaction that the resolution will be adopted by consensus and that the specific operative paragraphs, particularly operative paragraph 4, will be implemented immediately following conclusion of the debate. It is needless to stress that in this connection, the Security Council itself will remain seized of the matter until a democratic, non-racial South Africa is established on the basis of free elections and a new constitution.

In conclusion, I should like once again to thank the members of the Council for having promptly acceded to the request of the OAU to convene this meeting.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Namibia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, His Excellency Mr. Nathan Shamuyarira, has asked for the floor. I now call on him.

Mr. SHAMUYARIRA (Zimbabwe): I wish to address a remark that was made this morning by the Foreign Minister of South Africa in his long statement, which I cannot leave unchallenged or uncorrected. He said that

> "the ANC/Communist Party alliance had issued instructions to its representative in Harare to transfer weapons stored at Mashvinga in Zimbabwe to the northern border of the Transvaal for infiltration into South Africa. These weapons included automatic assault rifles and

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

grenade launchers and would be transported with the assistance of the Zimbabwean Army." (supra, pp. 14 and 15)

I should like to inform the Council that the information given to Mr. Botha is entirely false and without any foundation. Zimbabwe has no weapons on its soil bound for South Africa, and the Zimbabwe National Army has never assisted either the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) or the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) or any other organization in South Africa in carrying any arms bound for South Africa.

While Zimbabwe supports the political struggle of the liberation movements in South Africa and the democratic forces in general, it has never involved itself in armed conflict or in the violence occurring there. Quite to the contrary, we have condemned all violence and aid all parties to negotiate peacefully for the end of apartheid and the transfer of power. That statement, therefore, is completely false, and I wanted to assure the members of the Council of that.

But while I still have the floor, I should like to make a few brief remarks, which will take no more than two or three minutes. I realise that the time is late and a lot has been said already. My colleague the Foreign Minister of Namibia has said a number of things in summary that I also wanted to mention. In all the statements that have been made today, there appears to be support for the draft resolution before us, which will be adopted by consensus. There has been no opposition to the resolution - we are very pleased about that - including the operative paragraphs, but there are two issues that need to be mentioned that come out of today's discussions.

One is that there is a need for a referee of the situation in South Africa. I think that we in the Council and the United Nations in general

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

should view the role of the Special Representative as a slightly broader one. Groups in South Africa are already involved in a power struggle for the dominant position when the process has ended. That is quite normal. Mr. Botha has told us that he would like to see his Nationalist Party recruit a substantial number of black followers and become the dominant party. That is also quite normal, and other parties will be seeking to do the same. But I think that what should be avoided is a situation in which Mr. Botha himself, who is a participant in the political scene of South Africa and who is looking to benefit his Party, should also sit as the referee of the situation, of what the other parties can or cannot do. I think that there is an anomaly there that the Council should appreciate, and that we should look at some kind of supervision or refereeing of the process.

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

The second factor that came out clearly in today's discussion is this: while I accept what was said by a number of the leaders who spoke this morning for various traditional and tribal groups - we had statements from the spokesmen for Kwa Zulu, Bophuthatswana and Ciskei this morning, and Transkei, Kwandebele and Kangwane this afternoon - one wonders about the extent to which these people speak for their tribes or their populations. They asserted here that the ANC does not speak for all the black people of South Africa; I think they would also accept that they themselves do not necessarily speak for all the people in their areas.

Thus, how do we know, and how do we determine, the wishes of the people in those areas. Mr. Botha was telling us about the referendum the whites had in March, and he said it had closed the chapter of apartheid. But what about the blacks, who were not allowed to vote last March. Clearly, there is a need for some test of acceptability, some way of assessing the strength of the opinion of the non-white peoples, or those who could not vote last March, and the direction of their thinking, so we can get some authentic views and authentic information on the subject.

When the Chief of Kwa Zulu speaks, how many Zulus does he speak for? He speaks of Zulus as the largest nation; that may be so. But how many of them does he speak for? I know some Zulu-speaking South Africans, friends of mine, who are in the ANC, and some who are in the PAC, and some who are in COSATU and other organizations.

So there is a need, in the work we are going to be doing, to look at some organizing a test of acceptability, a test of the direction of thinking among the black people, so we can reach a realistic solution.

I merely wanted to mention those two points in passing.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Cape Verde.

For many years, the oppression caused by apartheid has been the object of repeated condemnations by the United Nations and the international community at large. This Council and the General Assembly have on various occasions considered and rejected the racist policies that for too many years denied the most basic rights to the majority of the South African population on account of race.

The fierce internal resistance to such abhorrent policies and the international isolation of the apartheid regime set in motion a process of change that led to important political developments in South Africa and to negotiations for a democratic South Africa. The CODESA talks undoubtedly represent a major stride forward in the process aimed at abolishing the remnants of apartheid and creating a democratic and stable South Africa.

Along with the rest of the world, my country attaches the utmost importance to the CODESA process and has been following the talks with great expectation. The current problems that led to the suspension of the negotiations are therefore a cause of serious concern for us.

We strongly believe that there is no viable alternative to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. To attain this goal, all efforts should be exerted by all parties concerned.

The climate of violence that seems to have emerged in South Africa is certainly a major obstacle to the achievement of that end and threatens to derail the much needed CODESA negotiations.

The time has come for a serious, persistent and effective response to these waves of violence, whose disruptive effect is casting a cloud over the future of the harmonious South Africa we so desire. We strongly urge the

(The President)

Government, which bears responsibility for the maintenance of law and order, to take all necessary effective measures to curb and contain the violence. We encourage all the parties concerned to contribute to the creation of a climate of non-violence that will facilitate the negotiations leading to a democratic South Africa.

Violence, as we see it, is in nobody's interest in South Africa. Apart from compromising the prospect of negotiations, violence spawns hatred which in the end will tear South African society further apart.

We are convinced that it is in the vital interest of all South Africans, whatever their race or political affiliation, to inherit, from the ashes of apartheid, a stable, just, peaceful and democratic South Africa.

The situation in South Africa is at a crucial juncture, which requires restraint and delicate handling. The need for stability and harmony in the country demands that the present difficulties be overcome as soon as possible, to allow for the early resumption of the negotiations for a democratic South Africa.

South Africa is too precious a country for us all, especially for us Africans. Its destiny is at the heart of the future of our continent as we see it, and its population nurtures legitimate aspirations so dear to our collective past in Africa.

It is therefore with a strong sense of shared interest and fraternal concern that we hope to see the problem of violence addressed as soon as possible in all its aspects, and the resumption of the negotiations for a democratic South Africa.

(The President)

We are gratified to have here with us very important political leaders of the country. Their testimony has been most useful to all of us. We pay a special tribute to Mr. Nelson Mandela, whose life is a symbol of the struggle against apartheid and whose political wisdom and statesmanship are major assets in the definition of the South African political landscape.

We hope that the draft resolution that this Council will soon adopt will assist in curbing the violence in South Africa, and the resumption of the negotiations.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

Before putting the draft resolution to the vote, I shall call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Our chance today to discuss the situation in South Africa comes at a critical moment in the history of that country. Along with the rest of the international community, Belgium had pinned its hopes on the process of democratization begun by CODESA.

At the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, those hopes were expressed in the adoption of a resolution on the situation in South Africa that seemed to us to do justice to the desire for peace and reform felt by the country's leading political forces.

(Mr. Noterdaeme, Belgium)

The resurgence of blind violence has thrown these developments radically off course. Belgium immediately voiced its great consternation at the events in Boipatong, and its sadness at the number of innocent victims in that massacre.

But we refuse to accept that this tragedy can bring to grief the entire process of democratization.

(Mr. Noterdaeme, Belgium)

We therefore call upon all the parties to respect scrupulously the commitments made at the signing of the September 1991 Peace Accord. We call upon the South African Government to spare no effort to bring about full disclosure of what happened at Boipatong and to bring to justice those responsible for that tragedy. We also call upon all the political forces in the country to show the necessary sense of responsibility in the current reform process in South Africa and to refrain from any act that might further worsen the situation.

At the same time, we are aware that the situation has deep roots in the injustices of the past. We therefore refrain from blaming only those directly responsible for the violence, because the violence is rooted not only in an unsuitable political system, but - even more deeply - in unacceptable social situations which go with that system. It would therefore be doubly tragic if the events at Boipatong halted the process of democratization, when they graphically illustrate how essential that process is.

The Council has before it a draft resolution on the situation in South Africa. My delegation has worked to see that the draft resolution, soon to be adopted, has a balanced text and is in keeping with reality. However, certain references to previous texts seem to us anachronistic. However tragic recent events, our Council owes it to itself to acknowledge the progress made.

As for the mandate to be given to the Secretary-General, it seems to us important not to lose sight of the fact that the process of democratization is above all domestic and national in character. We wish to encourage a resumption of dialogue, not the placing of that dialogue under supervision.

Over the past few years major, courageous steps, with irreversible consequences, have been taken towards the dismantling of apartheid. But it is

(Mr. Noterdaeme, Belgium)

clear that this development has meaning only if it is carried to its conclusion as soon as possible.

Other tasks just as urgent await the leaders of the new South Africa: those involved in forging, within unity, a new democratic, non-racial nation while contributing to the economic, social, cultural and political renewal of the whole African continent.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): Austria has not had an opportunity to express its views on the question of South Africa in the Security Council since October 1974. Indeed, the Council has not dealt with this question for well over three years. This debate is therefore timely and we welcome it.

We also welcome the high-level participation in the debate, and in particular the presence of so many African Foreign Ministers, including the Foreign Minister of Senegal and the Foreign Minister of Zimbabwe, who are still with us this evening, and, of course, Mr. Nelson Mandela. This testifies to the importance African leaders attach to the Security Council and to our work.

In recent years many things have changed in South Africa. Most changes were for the better. I am referring here, of course, to the abolition of the so-called pillars of apartheid. Much, however, remains to be done before we can truly speak of a new, democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. Among the outstanding problems to be dealt with before attaining the key objective of a new Constitution, agreement on the mechanisms for drawing up this Constitution and for organizing the process of transition are of paramount importance. This is why we welcomed the negotiations in CODESA, and it is also why we call upon all parties urgently to resume them in good faith. There is no viable alternative to the path of peaceful negotiations.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

It is for the South Africans themselves to shape their country, their society and their institutions. A new constitution should contain checks and balances, may well decentralize power and may well secure fair representation of all sectors of society.

In the meantime, at the request of the parties concerned, the international community can and should play a role in encouraging and supporting the process of change in South Africa. That is why our debate in this Council is important and why our decisions are important. That is also why Austria supports the idea of giving the Secretary-General a mandate to use his good offices towards creating conditions conducive to further progress.

At the outset I spoke of recent positive changes in South Africa. Alas, there has also been a wave of violence, culminating in the Boipatong massacre. We share in the grief of the bereaved and are deeply concerned by the massacre's consequences.

Among other causes, this violence has its roots in a highly fragmented political and social system which makes the emergence of a political culture of tolerance and mutual accommodation very difficult. In addition, there is a lack of respect for and credibility of the administrative and judicial authorities.

There is no way around the primary responsibility of the South African Government to protect the life and property of every South African. The National Peace Accord adopted last year to bring an end to the wave of violence has so far not yielded the expected results. At the request of the parties the international community could be of assistance. Austria has already called for an impartial inquiry regarding the recent violence and for bringing the perpetrators to justice. This would go a long way towards creating a climate of confidence in South Africa.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

I started my intervention by referring to the importance attached to the Council's consideration of the question of South Africa. Let me conclude by saying that the fact that the Council has been seized of this matter testifies to the growing belief that, as the Secretary-General put it in his seminal report "An Agenda for Peace", our aim must be to address the deepest causes of conflict: economic despair, social injustice and political oppression.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put draft resolution S/24288 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Cape Verde, China, Ecuador, France, Hungary, India, Japan, Morocco, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 765 (1992).

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, His Excellency Mr. Djibo Ka, has asked to speak. I invite His Excellency to make his statement.

Mr. KA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like first on behalf of the ministerial delegation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), representing President Abdou Diouf, current Chairman of the OAU, to express our sincere gratitude for the dispatch, precision and wisdom with which you, Mr. President, have led the Council's debate on a matter that is crucial for Africa. We are particularly satisfied with this long, thorough and serious debate, devoted essentially to the situation in South Africa, which is going through a decisive period in its life and history. That is why the impressive number of participants in the debate has been a comfort to us.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

On behalf of my colleagues and of President Abdou Diouf, I solemnly pledge that the OAU will faithfully extend to the Secretary-General's Special Representative in South Africa its full assistance and sincere cooperation in the discharge of his important task.

Finally, I should like to express the hope that this day will mark a new page in the history of South Africa, resolutely engaged, thanks to international and African solidarity, in a peaceful, democratic and irreversible transition to ensure the prompt advent of a non-racist South Africa based on law and justice.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further names inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.